The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CIX NEW YORK, SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1919 No. 2819

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 27

EDITORIALS:

The Return 30
Russian-Tweedledee and Erin-Tweedledum 31
Justice or Melodrama? 32
The Winnipeg Strike 32
Anna Howard Shaw 33

THE LATEST ALLIED-AMERICAN DEALING WITH LENIN 34

METTERNICHS—OLD AND NEW. By Proscopos 35

THE PLOT AGAINST MEXICO—I. By L. J. de Bekker 36

AMERICANISM IN NORTH DAKOTA. By W. G. Roylance 37

THE PLEASANCE. By Archibald MacMechan 39

FOREIGN CORRESPONDENCE:

The Jews in Poland. By a Special Correspondent 40

REFLECTIONS AFTER DISCHARGE. By Oswald W. Knauth 42

THROUGH A GATEWAY IN JAPAN. By Witter Bynner 43

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 43

CORRESPONDENCE 44

LITERATURE:

The Greatest Living Man of Letters 46
Galsworthy and the New Hedonism 47
A Good Mender of Bad Texts 48

BOOKS IN BRIEF 49

MUSIC: The Bach Festival at Bethlehem. By William E. Brooks 50

ART: The Fine Art of Weaving. By Arthur Upham Pope 51

BOOKS OF THE WEEK 51

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION 53

PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY THE NATION PRESS, INC.

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor — HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor

WILLIAM MacDONALD, ALBERT JAY NOCK, Associate Editors — LINCOLN COLCORD, FREDA KIRCHWEY

DAVID T. POTTINGER, Business Manager
MIRIAM R. WALTER, Circulation Manager

Subscription Rates—Four dollars per annum, postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $4.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $5.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: Nation, New York. Chicago Office: Room 1348, People's Gas Bldg. British Agents for Subscriptions and Advertising: Headley Bros., Pub., Ltd., 72 Oxford St., London.

IF anything can have affected the President's self-satisfaction when he landed, it should be the news from Minnesota. In what the English would call a by-election in the Fourth Congressional District, a seat which for years has been safely Democratic went to an independent Republican and Labor candidate in a four-cornered fight. In 1916 the late Congressman C. C. Van Dyke carried the district by no less than 12,000 votes; in 1918 he won it for the third time by a decreased majority. At the election on July 1 the Democrats obtained less than 7,000 votes out of 28,000 cast, and this despite the fact that every effort was made to poll a large party vote on the plea that the President must be supported, his work at Paris upheld and endorsed, etc. Oscar E. Keller, the successful candidate, polled about 12,000 votes, the Republican coming in second and the Democrat third. All of which signifies, of course, that the American people are solidly behind Wilson, the treaty, and the League of Nations.

THERE is every evidence that this country is becoming disgustingly pro-German with great rapidity. Despite all the orders given to our soldiers in Germany to refrain from associating with the unworthy people among whom they are quartered, we read with horror of the application of 144 of our soldiers within twenty-four hours of the signing of the peace treaty for permission to marry Hun women. We submit that this evidences so low a morale on the part of our soldiery as to merit the immediate attention of the National Security League. It is court martial these soldiers deserve and not matrimony. Again, we are profoundly grieved to note that Mrs. William Jay and other ardent defenders of the country from German music have announced their abandonment of all further opposition to its production. At that rate we shall have German opera back at the Metropolitan and in Chicago next winter and Richard Strauss at the Philharmonic concerts. Do we forget so easily? When we read of grave riots at Brest between French and American soldiers because an American officer saw fit to wipe his feet upon the French flag we can read into it nothing but that old, familiar German propaganda. The officer must have come from Milwaukee or Cincinnati—or tasted some of their indubitably pro-German beer. Then someone is stuffing the American press with statements to the effect that Americans will begin at once to trade with Germany and that the Germans are willing to commence their reparations forthwith, even to the extent of giving up the 140,000 milch cows upon which their starving infants are largely relying for milk. It is really terrible, this sudden yielding to the wiles of the enemy that we note on every side. Of what can our patriots be thinking?

WHEN it comes to arranging bomb-scares, the police have a game to play in which they can win all the points. New York, like other cities, was thoroughly alarmed by official anticipation of anarchist outrages on the Fourth of July. City, State, and National authorities all joined in to increase the anxiety, and we have actually heard of people leaving town to avoid what they considered the inevitable bloodshed. That nothing happened anywhere throughout the country is something for which we should all give most devout thanks. But it is now impossible for the public to find out whether there is any foundation for the alarm or not. The agents of the Department of Justice and the police need only look wise and say: "Why, it was our announcement that we were prepared which saved the day; if we could only show you all the secret information which we have received!" Quite so; but the public would be much more likely to believe this assumption of mysterious wisdom if it were not for the fact that all the authorities combined have up to now failed to produce a single one of the miscreants who placed the bombs on the second of June, or anyone who was in any way connected with the mailing of bombs a month before that. This is highly discreditable to the detectives, if only because it is making many deluded people insist that the whole thing was a bit of *agent provocateur* business on the part of those who wished to bring about repressive legislation in Washington. Even the incredibly limited Mr. Stevenson balks at this wholesale crying of wolf over the Fourth of July and

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

points out that if it is often repeated the public will refuse to be stirred or interested in further anarchist alarums.

WITH aerial ocean records going daily, it may perhaps not be good form to thrill over the arrival of the R-34, and yet we do. Indeed, it will be a long time before such stories of doing and daring cease to thrill because of their everyday character. It is, moreover, quite fitting that the giant rigid dirigible should have crossed the Atlantic so closely after the brilliant feats of the aeroplane and the hydroplane, for from the beginning there has been the intensest rivalry between the two forms of aerial locomotion. During the war, the aeroplane, as an offensive, has carried off the honors and rubbed them in by bagging more than one Zeppelin. But now, we notice, the crew of the R-34 on their arrival announced emphatically that theirs was *the* type of the future for Atlantic transportation. The R-34, they asserted, is already a back number though it crossed at an average speed greater than that of the fastest liner. Yet the weakness of the dirigible—the difficulty of landing and of being kept safe after landing—made itself felt during its brief stay in Mineola; the wind is a greater enemy when it is on land than when it sails the ether. Then, the terrifying expense bulks at least twice as large in peace as in war. Still, the fact is that thirty men crossed the ocean in comfort in less time than men have crossed before save in aeroplanes. Incidentally, the joke is surely on the Germans. The R-34 is nothing but a Zeppelin with British improvements upon the German invention. It was built to bomb Berlin, which is righteous, whereas bombing Paris and London was wicked. The stupid Germans! This triumph of the R-34 is but one of many things the British have achieved at Germany's cost because they would go to war and went to war brutally.

IN an extraordinary statement issued to the press by the executive board of the General Committee of Russian National Defence, of which A. A. Boublikoff is chairman, the peace treaty and the negotiations at Paris are attacked unsparingly on the score of their failure to solve the Russian problem. Needless to say, Mr. Boublikoff is not protesting in the name of Soviet Russia; the General Committee of Russian National Defence is affiliated with the Russian Information Bureau and the Russian Economic League, and represents many so-called "counter-revolutionary" Russian organizations in America, nineteen of which have signed their names to the protest. The significance of the statement lies in the fact that it is quite as bitter against the Entente Allies as it is against the Bolsheviki. Throughout the document the peace of Paris is likened to the German peace of Brest-Litovsk. The statement analyzes the territorial rearrangement of Russia that apparently is going on, and brands the activities of the Allies as the most bare-faced imperialism. "In a word, under the cover of fighting Bolshevism, around Russia a quarantine circle is being formed. This circle will economically strangle Russia for decades, when the very memory of Bolshevism in Russia will have been eliminated. . . . However incredible all these 'just' peace terms for Russia may be, the most incredible part of it is that they come to us, not from our enemies, but from our 'friends.' . . . In fact, in what sense do the Parisian peace terms for Russia differ from the 'shameful' Brest-Litovsk treaty? Only in this—so it would seem—that the Allies do not demand from Russia 6,000,000,000 marks of indemnity." Here is a curious shifting of the "counter-revolutionary" frame of mind, the preliminary phase of the same shift that has come about in Russia as the counter-revolutionists have recognized that there is no alternative between the Soviet régime and the régime of the Czar. In six months M. Boublikoff will be ready to enter the Soviet Government as Commissar of Transportation; and the Soviet Government thereby will be ready to take another step in mitigation of Bolshevism.

NORTH DAKOTA has sustained the Non-partisan League. The legislature last spring enacted a remarkable economic programme comprising provisions for a State-owned bank, State-owned terminal elevators, flour mills, and packing plants, and certain important tax-exemptions. The principal measures on this programme were at once met by a referendum petition gotten up by the financial and commercial interests, which would be unfavorably affected by their operation. The referendum election was held June 26 and resulted in affirming the entire programme by a majority of 7,000. The campaign was spirited and acrimonious. We are glad to record the interesting fact that when some farmers became restless and noisy under the offensive tactics of anti-League speakers, Governor Frazier insisted that the right of free speech be upheld and that the opposition be given a fair hearing. One of the oddest charges brought against the League farmers is that they are socialists. Some of the measures referred to undoubtedly are quite what they would be under the programme of State socialism—and hence in our judgment carry the seeds of failure—but the coincidence is accidental. The farmers are far enough from any interest in theoretical socialism or any knowledge of it. They are simply business men who want to do business on the same terms as other people—namely, to buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. For many years they have had the price of their own produce fixed for them by alien speculative interests, and been severely exploited by alien control of markets, terminals and credit; and now they are tired of it and determined to put a stop to it. Now that they have won their contention, it probably does not make much difference to them what names they are called; but the fact is that as the term socialism is understood in the language of description rather than of abuse, they are no more socialists than are the members of the Union League Club.

"MOB violence should be suppressed and by State authorities. If this is not done, it is very probable that Federal intervention will not be long delayed. . . . Without awaiting Federal action I submit that it is the duty of Georgia to take drastic steps to deal with the question." Thus writes Governor Dorsey of Georgia in his message to the legislature of June 28. He is quite right. If there is not immediate proof of a determination on the part of the Southern executives to deal vigorously with this question, there will be a nation-wide campaign to make lynching a Federal crime. Notice to this effect was served upon the Governor of Mississippi by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People when he admitted his inability, two weeks ago, to protect an accused man who was subsequently lynched. Despite an absurdly optimistic statement as to a falling off in lynchings issued by Tuskegee Institute, the evil tends to increase. More-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over, two of the latest victims, one in Missouri and one in Alabama, have been white men charged with murder. Governor Dorsey declares that there are many "outrageous lynchings which could be prevented" if there were adequate laws. He would have the Legislature create a special bureau of the Government to act at once when there is danger of a mob crime, without having to await a call from local or military authorities, and would have it given the power to discharge peace officers proved derelict in performing their duty. Finally, Governor Dorsey would provide a state grand jury, drawn from all over the state, to investigate and indict the mob criminals, and a special state jury to try them at any place where there would be the best chance of convicting. These are all excellent and constructive recommendations, which should be made into law forthwith.

COLLEGE teachers have more need than ever to look sharply at the schemes of the Carnegie Foundation, now that an international spasm of reaction is trying to force all minds into a new, safe uniform for peace as bodies were recently called to put on, for an emergency, the uniform of war. Innocent as the Foundation may well be of any desire to direct and straiten the opinions of its learned beneficiaries, it is still, we must remember, a board on which the teachers are not directly represented, administering funds owned neither by the policy-holders nor by representatives duly chosen. As such, it looks remarkably like another form of pressure, from without and above, aimed to control a body of persons who above all others must be free. The spokesmen of the Foundation have shown themselves deeply worried for fear its original promises, if kept, might pauperize the professors who quaintly expected to get without further paying for it what they had been voluntarily told they ought to get because they had already deserved and earned it. Without wishing to increase the burden of distress which the spokesmen at present feel, we do not mind suggesting that workers of any trade may be spiritually pauperized—if the spokesmen can guess what that means—by being pressed to contribute to an organization which is said to be solely for their good, but which they do not control, and of which they cannot be sure whether it will go on doing what it says it will do or whether it may not again, as in the past, have to change its methods so much as almost to change its nature.

NOW that peace has been signed, we take it for granted that the members of the Friends' Reconstruction Unit who have applied for permission to enter Germany under the leadership of Jane Addams will be permitted to embark upon their grateful mission of bringing aid to the German victims of the Allied blockade. They have done such admirable work in France and in such an excellent spirit that we are sure they will be welcome wherever they go, and they will find the need appalling, notably in Austria, if they should venture there. From Geneva an American newspaper-woman writes us, "The accounts of famine conditions in Vienna are simply unbearable. The women who came from across the line for the international gathering looked as if they had come straight out of hell." To carry on this Quaker work in Germany, and particularly in Saxony, which Mr. Hoover certifies to be the most needy portion of Europe today, a special fund of $50,000 has been asked from America at once by the American Friends' Service Committee, 22 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia. We warmly commend the undertaking to our readers.

ONE of the most interesting and promising bequests ever made by a decedent in this country is that of Augustus D. Juilliard, who died April 25, leaving five million dollars for the promotion of music. The Juilliard Musical Foundation, provided for in the will, has three general objects: (1) the aiding of students of music, (2) the giving of concerts, recitals, and other forms of musical entertainments without profit, (3) the support and furtherance of opera at the Metropolitan Opera House. Music has made splendid progress in the United States during the last decade and unquestionably has a great future. The strong Continental European strains in our population have made us, really, by and large, a music-loving people, and our taste has developed and improved in a most gratifying manner. We are accumulating a body of musical resources, as yet probably quite unproductive, but ready to our hand as soon as a period of general spiritual activity sets in upon the world—and this may take place much sooner than present appearances justify one in expecting. The Juilliard bequest, in our judgment, is most timely; it is perhaps in a way to be more beneficent, dollar for dollar's worth, than if devoted to any other public purpose. A great deal depends, of course, upon its administration.

ALL of this suggests, at once, the general pros and cons about subsidies. Subsidies for the prosecution of art and science have as a rule worked pretty well in Europe, less well in England, and rather unprofitably here. The reason seems to be that in the European kingdoms these subsidies were granted from the monarch's private purse, while in England and the United States they proceed from the collective action of a group of individuals or the munificence of some private person like Mr. Juilliard; and in the former case, the chance of intelligent and disinterested administration is rather better. The monarch, by virtue of his position, is habitually lifted up above a great many littlenesses and eccentricities that beset a private person, and is also able to command the most disinterested advice. Matthew Arnold, in his examination of Continental schools, long ago pointed this out as the reason for the superiority of the crown patronage schools of Prussia over the private or semi-private foundations of England. The same is true of subsidies to the arts. It will be difficult, perhaps impossible, to keep the administration of Mr. Juilliard's bequest out of the hands of a clique. We hope it may be done, because no fate could be more enervating and retarding; but frankly, we do not see how it can be done. Perhaps the best that can be hoped for is exemption from a few of the most usual and obvious disabilities, such as permanent trusteeship and a self-perpetuating board. We hope, too, that actual practicing musicians will be given a large share in the conduct of the enterprise. Unmodified lay management is as great a misfortune as we can apprehend for it. A rather loose and human policy, not over-tempted by consideration of "efficiency" and display, a generous, even sometimes a prodigal willingness to experiment, a steady contemplation of the whole field of music as its province, resisting the tendency toward specialties and the more vehement tendency towards eccentricities—if the public can get as much as this from the administration of this most handsome legacy, it may well be satisfied.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Return

NO amount of official welcoming, no array of battleships however imposing, no amount of enthusiasm however stimulated, can hide in the long run the fact that Woodrow Wilson returns from Paris an utterly defeated man. That he is prepared to deny this is obvious; the summary of his programme for further deluding the American people, cabled after his interview with the American correspondents, reveals what his procedure is to be. He is to assert unblushingly that this was the most successful peace conference ever held; that it has established a new charter of liberties for the world and especially for the small nations. He is to dwell upon old nations reëstablished and ancient wrongs undone, and then he will deprecate the gross injustice to Japan, to China, and all the others, and the violation of every one of his Fourteen Peace Points as inevitable, in view of the forces with which he has had to contend. He will plume himself upon having compromised as much as he did. The London *Labour Leader* declared the other day that "even his colossal vanity" will hardly be brought into service for the amount of self-deception necessary to the assertion that the treaty conforms to the Fourteen Points. It does not know him. His egotism would not stop at that.

For ourselves we have today only pity for the weak, compromising, morally-defeated man who returned from Paris on Tuesday. Never was there such an opportunity vouchsafed to anyone in modern times to make over the world. Never did anyone ever go into a conference room so admirably equipped or with a better programme drafted by his own pen. Every trump card was Mr. Wilson's. Ships, all the remaining money in the world, and a large share of the food, were his with which to reinforce his demands. And what were those demands? Only that the Allies should live up to their plighted faith, solemnly given when the armistice was proposed and accepted. What, we hear it said, would you have had him dictate everything to the Allies? No, dictation was unnecessary. We would simply have had him demand that the Allies live up to their pledges, and would have had him withdraw the instant he discovered that they had no intention of living up to their troth—the Fourteen Peace Points, no annexations, no punitive indemnities, freedom of the seas, and all the rest. But they took his measure at the start. Perhaps they had studied the career of Mr. Wilson before they measured swords with him; if they did, they must have learned that there is no outstanding place in his entire career when, having taken a position, he held to it through thick and thin, come what might. Never, so far as we are aware, has he put his back to the wall and declared that sink or swim, survive or perish, he would not abandon a given principle if it cost him his career. When he surrendered on the first of his Fourteen Peace Points, open covenants of peace openly arrived at, Clemenceau, Lloyd George, and all the rest knew what they could do. The freedom of the seas was sidetracked without even a discussion, so far as published. Everybody in Paris who was at all cognizant of what was going on knew when the Conference opened that Mr. Wilson came prepared to give away a large part of his programme if he could only get the League of Nations. For the proposed League, Mr. Wilson threw away the chance to introduce in fact the new order of things which he falsely boasts that he has accomplished. He lost in Paris because he went there mentally prepared to lose, because he was neither saturated with conviction nor steeped in principle.

It would be very easy to pen further indictments of the President out of his own mouth, to convict him for the thousandth time of treachery to his own ideals—such noble and lofty ideals, and so full of glorious promise to humanity as to make his abandonment of them the highest form of treason to the nation and to humanity. Were there one statesman in Congress but half a Burke, Mr. Wilson would shrivel up in a day under his oratory and his logic. Were it permitted to heckle the President, his coming tour would collapse at the very first meeting under the unanswerable questions which would be hurled at him from every part of the hall—unanswerable because they would be his own words, his own broken promises, his own falsified pledges, his own laying down of principles upon which he once based the whole moral standing of the American nation. We merely wish to remind our readers, and to set down for the future records our belief that when the truth is understood, it will be a pitiful figure that Mr. Wilson will cut.

As we write this, we are, of course, well aware that he will have his way. The public, wearied of the war and its problems, annoyed at the existing social unrest, is making no effort to understand what entangling alliances we are committed to. It is eager to get back to the business of making money and to resume its habit of extracting all the pleasure out of life that it can without Governmental interference. It wants the rest of the army home and the last page of the chapter closed; its interest was far deeper in the Willard-Dempsey battle last week than in the peace treaty, in the dirigible balloon than in Mr. Wilson. The President is fortunate, too, in the attitude of his adversaries in Congress. They have, as we have so often pointed out, made the fatal mistake of basing their opposition on nationalistic instead of upon moral and ethical grounds. So the treaty will be ratified in all its imperialistic wickedness. The President will obtain the sanction he desires.

Yet we cannot believe that even his colossal egotism can conceal all the facts from himself. No amount of self-deception, no amount of beautiful language and imagery, can hide the truth that those liberals in England, France, Italy and America who most warmly welcomed his Fourteen Points and fought for them tooth and nail are today disillusioned, disheartened, discouraged, because, after all his promises to the plain people of Europe, Mr. Wilson did not, when the final show-down came, appeal over the heads of the men who euchred him on every trick. What the Rome *Tribuna* said editorially on July 1 contains the exact truth as to the fall of Mr. Wilson—a fall as profound as it is pathetic and tragic:

> Seven months ago an immense halo of popularity surrounded President Wilson. Europe awaited him as the Messiah of a new era of history, and now he leaves amid almost general indifference. . . . It has been a psychological drama, as President Wilson believes, perhaps sincerely, that he incarnated not only the aspirations of America, but also the aspirations of Europe. Instead, President Wilson, despite his pure intentions, failed of his object. He returns to America leaving behind him a chaos of disorder, passion, and disillusion, since he could not conclude peace according to his principles, but made a compromise brought about by the overbearing attitude of the strong toward the weak.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Russian-Tweedledee and Erin-Tweedledum

ANYONE wishing to get up a nice respect for the Espionage Act and at the same time take the measure of our Government's attitude toward Russia might have had a good opportunity by being in New York last Tuesday evening. Three huge sightseeing wagons toured the streets, loaded to the guards with men and women waving the flag of the Irish Republic and singing lustily and with fulness of freedom the songs of Irish independence. To us, who for some reason imagine this sort of thing pretty well in keeping with sound American tradition, it was a pleasant and inspiring sight; and we found ourselves also, for once in our lives, in substantial agreement with the majority. The passers-by seemed to approve; the police looked on with benevolence; and the newspapers, which really are the court of final instance in matters of this kind, all withheld their horrific denunciations next morning. In short, this peculiarly daring act of enemy propaganda, this peculiarly open infraction of the Espionage Act, seemed to "get by," as the slang goes, with éclat and acclaim. Suppose, however, three wagon-loads of Russians had ventured out on Fifth Avenue, waving *their* revolutionary flags and singing even the mild type of rebel anthem composed by Gretchaninov for the intercalary bourgeois régime,—how far would they have gotten? What would the police have done? Whence could the next day's editorials have extemporized a glossary adequate to deal with the intolerable outrage upon America's hospitality to the downtrodden, the inexpressibly dreadful and sinister menace to the institutions of democracy? And yet, in the official purview of the United States Government, the Irish Republic and the Russian Soviet Republic stand upon precisely the same footing.

No wonder Mr. Polk wants to resign and get back to a job that a full-grown man may at least pretend to take seriously. Eamonn de Valera, President of the Irish Republic —more power to him!—comes to this country and takes the presidential suite at the Waldorf. Is he promptly nabbed and haled before the judgment-seat as an alien propagandist fomenting rebellion against a Power with which this Government is associated? Does a pack of State constabulary and private detectives, headed by the noisome Stevenson, raid his apartments and steal his belongings? Do the newspapers raise the view-halloo, and the Senate appoint an investigating committee made up of persons who to save their lives could not tell off-hand whether Sinn Fein is the name of a new paper collar or a town in the County Cavan? Or, finally, is he picked up at large and chucked into Ellis Island like a dead cat into an ash-barrel, to be deported by our bureaucracy as a pernicious foreigner?

Hardly. One observes with deep interest and immense amusement that nothing of the sort takes place. On the contrary—talk about enemy propaganda!—he harangued forty thousand people in Boston the other day, where he was received by the Legislature of Massachusetts in joint session. Governors, Senators, and mayors pay court to him and do him honor. He issues a presidential statement of Irish republican policy, and the newspapers print it in full. He proposes to pay off the $500,000 issue of Fenian bonds, put out in 1866 to finance an invasion of Canada, and the same jealous guardians of our national honor roar as gently as the sucking dove. He gets a front-page spread whenever he wants it, with unexampled editorial kindliness thrown in, and as far as our information goes, the Postmaster-General and his assiduous Solicitor, Mr. Lamar, have not declared the offending publications unmailable.

All of which, philosophically, is water to our mill. True, we happen to be wholly sympathetic with the Irish Republic. For us, the principle of self-determination is no "good-enough Morgan" to gloze some hoodwinking political knavery, but a real principle, to be respected under all circumstances and by whomsoever invoked. But we are equally for freedom of speech and of assembly; these too are real principles. Hence we ask our readers kindly to imagine Nicolai Lenin making his way to this country, taking up quarters at one of our best hotels, if he could get them, and embarking on a whole-hearted crusade up and down the land in behalf of his government. Can one guess what would happen to him? Why, even a horse would laugh at such a question, and not necessarily a blooded horse, either; a saw-horse would laugh at it.

What then, is the difference between Tweedledee Lenin and Tweedledum de Valera? A mighty difference, though none of the institutional voices of our society are really straining themselves to explain it. The superficial observer is content to remark that the Irish in this country control several million votes. This is true and it is weighty, but it does not by any means tell the whole story. The theory of de Valera's republic is political; the theory of Lenin's republic is purely administrative. There is the point. A political government contemplates *per se* no interference with the existing economic order; an administrative government contemplates very serious interference with it. A political government has for its first and foremost business to maintain the stratification of society into a privileged, income-receiving class and a propertyless, dependent class; an administrative government tends to efface this stratification. And here we have the all-important and unforgivable difference. If Lenin would set up a good, foursquare, privilege-maintaining political republic of the Lvov-Miliukov type, it would be no time at all before we should be discovering what a great man he is and what a pity he was so long misunderstood. Then when he came here, Mr. Burleson and the other authorities would all obligingly look the other way, and he could get *his* share of front-page space and editorial obsequiousness—even in *The New York Times*—set next to pure reading matter. How many mayors and governors invited him around would of course depend on the status of the Russian vote; such matters, like the tariff, are local issues. But however he might fare socially, we should hear precious little about the horrors of Bolshevism. Even the massacres would turn out to be no worse than those everywhere incident to the formation of a "stable government," and not to be mentioned under the circumstances.

But nothing like this is apt to happen, and so we propose a vote of thanks to the President of the Irish Republic for enabling the American people to enjoy a first-class joke on themselves. Here's a health to you, Eamonn, *slanthu!* May you live long, and your shadow never grow less! And as you go about the country, laughing in your sleeve, may you feel an Irishman's brotherly-kindness for those who struggle upward in Russia, for they, too, believe they are fighting the age-long fight of the Irish people, the fight for freedom.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Justice or Melodrama?

NOTIONS about justice, in the heads of dull or selfish or angry men, have done so much harm that we sometimes despairingly inquire whether it would not be better if the very principle itself had never been discovered. Dull men follow paths which they have been told are just until they ruin them with ruts. Selfish men are just only to themselves with a complacency denied to those who have no doctrine to sustain them. Angry men vindicate their rages and unreason by pointing to the primitive sense—father of revenge and vendetta—from which we so difficultly free ourselves in the long progress toward civil conditions. If justice, according to an enthusiastic hyperbole of Emerson's, is the rhyme of things, then the vulgar conceptions of it are no more than tinkling couplets. A blow struck must rhyme *instanter* with a blow received; an eye rhymes with an eye, a tooth with a tooth, burning with burning, and strife with strife. Or, to allude to another mode of literature, justice in its primitive aspects is merely melodrama, wherein virtue is always rewarded with prosperity and evil always fatally punished.

The mood now prevailing in the world is the mood of melodrama, on a larger scale, perhaps, than ever before in human history. Germany, a bully and a brute, has been beaten at her own foul game; therefore let her be joyously annihilated, while the gallery gods who fill the theatre of the world almost from top to bottom hoot and glory at the justice weighed out to her. What makes it harder to contend against the uproar is that the uproar at first thought seems justifiable. Nemesis never looks like so righteous a doctor as when he feeds a poisoner his own poison. But we may rightly suspect first thoughts. For civilization, after all, is but the substitution for first thoughts of second or third or hundredth thoughts, reason supplanting passion, and polity guiding anarchic instinct. Melodrama is what commonly occurs to us first, in the form of those too neat or too hasty moral conclusions to which we are all more or less prone to jump when we allow ourselves to indulge too amply the sense of primitive justice which we share with all the savages of our ancestry. Just now the savages are stirring in their groves deep within us.

We do not, of course, jump too hastily to conclusions merely by reason of our ruder sense of justice. There is involved also a certain obscure instinct toward art, toward rounding out and completing and closing a chapter. Paradox cheerfully says, not forgetting Oscar Wilde, that affairs are trying to conform to dramaturgy, that the war is trying to shape itself a good fifth act. But paradox is not needed, for few things are clearer than that centuries of literature are now indeed influencing our attitude toward the peace and the treaty. Obscurely, again let it be emphasized, we have felt that we were witnessing, or acting, the vastest of dramas. The curtain, for us, rose sharply with the Austrian ultimatum and the invasion of Belgium. The sinking of the Lusitania, let us say, was the villain's fatal blunder, which brought against him a fresh, powerful enemy. The odds then deserting him, he hazarded all on a single blow, lost, and came down in a fearful wreck with the spent world falling about him. Is it not due and natural that there should descend another curtain to hide the bloody stage, and that the lights should flash sharply on, and that we should turn away, contented though somewhat subdued, to eat, drink, and make love, possibly commenting upon the actors as we go? Of course the peace on which the curtain falls must be dramatically satisfying, the villain dead or prostrate and the hero in the ascendant. Our sense of form must be served, our taste for melodramatic finality gratified. If the piece ends happily for us, justice has been done.

Justice or melodrama? It is only in art, and that not always the truest, that things come out so right. History has no beginning, no middle, no end, but moves everlastingly in some dim direction of which we at least do not know the secret. Poets and dramatists may honorably pilfer from history such materials as they require, and may of course work them into forms more compact or conclusive than life itself. But history cannot be handled so masterfully, for we can never be sure at what point in it we are standing. When the Lusitania went down, we did not know whether her loss opened the first act or the last. When we entered the war we could not be sure whether the fourth act of five or of fifty acts had ended. And it is now far too early to say that the peace just signed absolutely concludes the drama. The business of the treaty is not to close the war but to open the peace, not to avenge those who died, but to preserve those who still live, not to crown events past with poetic justice, which belongs to the technique of melodrama, but to prepare for events to come by trusting to the higher and humaner justice which is less concerned with righting old wrongs than with trying to foresee and prevent new wrongs—the justice, let us call it, of plain prose.

A Greek trilogy, when some vast design of fate had been conducted on the stage through devastation and horror to retribution and purgation, was rounded out by hilarious mirth in the satyr-play which followed. There impudence had its fling, while the tense nerves of the spectators relaxed, and they came back to the realities of life. It does not appear, however, that the Greeks, a reasonable as well as artistic people, cared to have their afterpieces look too much like tragedy, or even like revolution.

The Winnipeg Strike

THE great Winnipeg strike ended on Thursday, June 26, just six weeks to a day after it began. The Labor leaders agreed to call off the sympathetic strike on condition that the provincial Government would agree to the appointment of a Commission to investigate every phase of the strike from its earliest origin. It will probably be a one-man Commission in the shape of ex-Judge Robson, who has always been a sincere progressive, and holds the confidence of all parties in Winnipeg. Meanwhile the metal workers are the chief gainers by the strike, as the iron-masters issued a statement signifying their acceptance of collective bargaining in a degree which is satisfactory to the men. The strikers were not able to secure a promise of general reinstatement, but though the striking postmen, firemen, and civic employees are decreed to have permanently forfeited their posts, the services of most of the other workers are so urgently required to overtake the congestion of business that they will be promptly reinstated. Business throughout the whole of western Canada has suffered seriously from the strike, and the loss in wages to the workers of Winnipeg alone amounts to over four million dollars, which will be severely felt in the coming winter. The men in the other prairie cities have mostly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gone back to work, but there is no sign of any settlement of the general strike in Vancouver.

The number of arrests in Winnipeg now far exceeds one hundred, more than half of them being non-British and therefore *prima facie* in these times, according to Canada's rulers, tinged with Bolshevist doctrines. Only two persons lost their lives in the affray of June 21, but it is creditable rather to the citizens of Winnipeg than to the Government that more bloodshed did not accompany the strike. The Cabinet is still much perturbed over the situation and moves with uneasy stupidity in the paths of blind reaction. In the manœuvres over the Budget, which continued a policy of class favoritism in taxation, it has just lost the only real Liberal in the Cabinet—Mr. T. A. Crerar, lately Minister of Agriculture, who is the special representative of the western farmers. Before the arrests were made, Mr. J. A. Calder, the Minister of Immigration, rushed through both houses in one day an amendment to the Immigration Act permitting the deportation of British-born residents of Canada who had come within the scope of its "sedition" clauses. The power to deport moral undesirables already existed, but a British subject who had entered Canada could not be deported for political offences. The amendment practically establishes a divided citizenship for the British Commonwealth and must surely cause anxiety in imperialist circles in London. There is a provision in the Immigration Act which allows a Special Departmental Board to sit upon the cases of "undesirables" and if necessary recommend their deportation. There is little doubt that the Cabinet at first intended to avail itself of this star chamber procedure for the Winnipeg leaders, and thus escape the difficulties of an open trial. The Trades and Labor Congress of Canada intervened through its President, and intimated that a wholesale protest by labor would be made from Halifax to Vancouver if a fair civil trial were not granted. The Cabinet has no stomach for further troubles, and accordingly has agreed that the trial of the Winnipeg prisoners will take place in the ordinary civil courts. The British Labor party, at its conference at Southport, passed a strong resolution of protest against the attempt of the Canadian Government to deport secretly British-born leaders for participation in industrial disputes and urged the British Government to use its influence against any such act so contrary to Anglo-Saxon traditions.

On Mr. J. A. Calder, the Minister of Immigration, must rest the chief blame for the reactionary obscurantism of the Federal Government. Long a professed radical while he was dependent for office upon the suffrages of the Saskatchewan farmers, he has now obviously entered the service of the reactionary interests of Canada. As leader of the Liberals in the Cabinet, he could, had he chosen, have insisted upon the pursuit of a liberal and fair-dealing policy; but instead, in his capacity as Minister, he piloted through the House the most reactionary piece of legislation that has disfigured the statute books of a British country for many a long day. Yet this politician is the son of an emigrant Scotch carpenter whose death by an accident left his family to face a hard struggle. No member of the Cabinet ought to be more sympathetic with the cause of the workers of Canada, because he knows well their trials; but Mr. Calder is now obviously revealed as one of those opportunists who are liberals only when liberalism means office and the spoils thereof.

Anna Howard Shaw

ANNA SHAW was the ideal type of reformer, if unlimited courage, unquenchable determination, and unusual eloquence, plus humor and good nature, count for anything. Nothing daunted her, nothing dampened the ardor of her rare spirit and nothing could embitter her. She was ever as certain of the triumph of her cause as she was convinced that there is a divine plan for humanity by which it will yet be saved from itself. With a mind that was a match for any man's in its clearness and logic, her feminine charm never left her. Indeed, she was the despair of the anti-suffragists because she was so normal and sane, so sound and so effective. The solons of the daily press who have fought suffrage and every other achieved reform with all the vigor they are now seeking to prevent further progress got no help from Anna Shaw in their favorite pastime of proving that woman suffrage meant trousered, unsexed women, free love, the ruining of the home, and the spoiling of the lord of creation's dinner. She not only confuted them in her own sweet personality, she liked nothing better than to take one of these solemn editorial pronouncements, say from *The New York Times*, and puncture it with the lightning thrusts of the rapier of her wit and sarcasm.

Next to her saving grace of humor, Anna Shaw's common sense stood her in great stead. Then, she was American in her every fibre; indeed she was a true pioneer's daughter, for her early hardships in Michigan, so graphically described in her admirable autobiography, gave her a keen edge for the struggle of her life, as it made her profoundly sympathetic with all the victims of our social order. Her three years in the slums of Boston discouraged her not at all. But they made her feel that she was at the bottom of a pit and that the dwellers therein could neither be protected nor rescued until there was a strong wall built around the top. She climbed out to help build that wall. And in herself she was a shining proof that if you give the disfranchised and disadvantaged an inch they will take an ell. A preacher at seventeen, when for women to aspire to the pulpit was sacreligious, she turned to medicine only to find that it, too, was no remedy but a palliative. So she braved public opinion again by taking the stump to demand a political remedy in a cause that as late as 1898 seemed utterly hopeless to those who cannot read the hearts of men and women.

When the great leaders and pioneers in this cause, Lucy Stone, Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan B. Anthony, passed off the stage the mantle of leadership naturally fell to Anna Shaw. Only few know how heavy was the burden, how unceasing the wearing toil. She freely gave everything she had to give without thought of self. Quite naturally people loved her and took that proprietary interest in her that is the surest proof that the way to their hearts has been found. Fortunately it was given to her to see the practical triumph of her cause in the submission of the Constitutional amendment; the solid South was broken for the third time the day she died. What more can any reformer ask than to behold the day of victory after the straightest, bravest, and most uncompromising of battles? Who can regard Anna Shaw's noble career and not take heart for the future, for however long and difficult the road, her ancient enemies of reaction can no more prevent the coming of true opportunity and liberty for the masses than they were able to thwart her in her battle for political freedom.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Latest Allied-American Dealing with Lenin

THE NATION is enabled to give to its readers this week one of the most extraordinary and sensational contributions to the vexed question of the relationship of the United States and the Allied Governments with Russia which has yet appeared. It is a wireless statement issued by the People's Russian Information Bureau in Buda Pest after its receipt early in June by wireless from Moscow over the signature of the Russian Government and it makes the direct and open charge that Wilson, Lloyd George, and Colonel House drew up a new set of terms for a peace conference in Russia and for an Allied peace with Russia. This statement has been published in England, but so far as *The Nation* is aware, only obscurely there. We give it in the exact form it reaches us, evidently somewhat injured in the double translation, but nevertheless telling the truth:

It is now evident that the Allied Governments—although professing to have abandoned the idea of military intervention in Russia—have, in reality, never changed their policy, and are secretly preparing, underhand, a new attack on the Russian Soviet Government. Under the pressure of working-class opinion, the Allied Powers have in the past made several peace proposals to Russia, but they have always formulated impossible terms. When the Soviet Power, to defeat these manœuvres, did finally accept these terms, the Allied Powers then announced to the world that their proposals had been rejected. This was the policy followed both with regard to the invitation to the island of Prinkipo and to the proposal of Nansen.

Concerning the third peace offer, the Allied Powers thought it best not to give any public information, because, in this case, the acceptance of their proposals by the Soviet Government could be proved by documents. This proposal was brought to Russia by the American, Bullitt, Captain Pettit and the journalist Steffens. The Soviet Government, at the Bullitt express request, reluctantly restrained its desire for an immediate publication of such terms.

Now, after the resignation of Bullitt from the Peace Delegation at Versailles, and the continued attempts made by the Allied Governments to overthrow the Soviet Power, and in the face of a further shedding of blood, the Soviet Government publishes to the world those peace conditions. They were drawn up by Wilson, Colonel House, and Lloyd George, and were sent to us through Bullitt.

The Allied Governments invited all the Governments really existing in Russia to a new Peace Conference upon a basis agreed upon by all the Allied Powers, leaving only details to be further arranged. The Soviet Government made some modifications, and these were accepted by Bullitt. The open invitation should have been sent out on the 10th of last April.

Since it was not the desire of the Allied Governments really to bring about peace, but only to hide from their peoples the continuation of the war, in the hope of finally ruining Russia, the invitation was not sent.

•

The Allied Terms

The principal points in the Allied terms were:

An armistice to be declared on all Russian fronts whilst the Peace Delegates were discussing the following:

1. All the Governments formed within the territory of the old Russian Empire to keep their full power over the territories occupied by them, until the inhabitants should declare the form of Government preferred by them.
2. None of such Governments to attempt to overthrow another by force.
3. The blockade of Russia to be raised.
4. Reëstablishment of commercial relations.
5. All produce existing or received in Russia to be accessible to all classes of the population, without any distinction.
6. All the above Russian Governments to grant full and complete amnesty to political opponents, soldiers included.
7. The Allied troops to evacuate Russia.
8. Simultaneous reduction of the Soviet and of the Anti-Soviet armies to peace footing.
9. All the above Russian Governments to recognize, jointly, the financial obligations of the former Russian Empire.
10. Freedom of residence and movement of all Russian subjects over all parts of Russia.
11. Repatriation of all prisoners of war.

England and America were to guarantee the observance of these terms on the part of France.

Although the Red Army was then on the eve of taking possession of Odessa, the Crimea, and the Don region, the Soviet Government was ready to accept these terms; to accept the *status quo:* in the certain hope that the inhabitants of those parts of Russia not under the Soviet régime would, sooner or later, withdraw their support from their reactionary and monarchic Governments.

The publication of these proposals shows once more the hypocrisy of the Allied Governments, and exposes the lie that it was the Soviet Government which refused to cease hostilities. The double dealing of the Allied Governments has but one result, that of closing still further our ranks, to fight to the last, against the unholy alliance of small and big Imperialist Governments in this attempt to enslave the workers and peasants of Russia.

The Nation itself is in a position, through information received direct from Paris, to state that the above facts are accurate, that Messrs. Bullitt and Steffens did take a memorandum into Russia and that that memorandum was in the handwriting of Philip Kerr, private secretary to Mr. Lloyd George. That did not prevent Mr. Lloyd George from stating, in reply to a question in the House of Commons by Mr. Clynes asking as to "approaches alleged to have been made to his government," from Russian sources, "I think I know what my right honorable friend refers to. *There is some suggestion that an American came back* [from Russia]. It is not for me to judge the value of these communications, but if the President of the United States had attached any value to them he would have brought them before the Peace Conference. . . ." This was a double prevarication made to the House of Commons because he was not only aware of the Kerr memorandum, but breakfasted with Mr. Bullitt as soon as Mr. Bullitt returned from Russia. Still he denied that Mr. Bullitt was on any official mission.

It is further of interest to know that Mr. Bullitt himself drew up the Nansen correspondence with the Big Four with the exception of the reply of the Council of Four to the Nansen proposition, which the Big Four substituted for Mr. Bullitt's draft, setting forth substantially the conditions cited above.

The above publication recalls the fact that *The Manchester Guardian's* Helsingfors correspondent as far back as May 27 asked who had suppressed Lenin's radiograms in which Lenin accepted the Nansen-Bullitt-Lloyd George-Wilson offer and asked for the naming of delegates. This publication proves once more how indebted the world is to the Lenin Government for throwing a little daylight upon the tortuous secret diplomacy which has gone on and is going on in Paris.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Metternichs—Old and New

By PROSCOPOS

HE was the most famous statesman his country produced in a century. The great comedy of the world never had so fertile an author, an actor so consummate. His imperturbability, his prescience, his diplomatic dexterity were everywhere praised. He came to be considered the one great oracle whose every word was full of meaning, if only you could get it.

He played his lofty rôle with becoming gravity. No adulation could equal his self-appreciation. "All eyes, all expectations are directed to precisely that point where I happen to be." "My presence in Italy produces an incalculable effect." "I have no need of learned men. I want faithful subjects. He who would serve me must do what I command. He who cannot do this, or who comes full of new ideas, may go his way. If he does not, I shall send him."

He hated the Revolution. He lavished upon it a wealth of metaphorical denunciation. It was "the disease which must be cured," "the volcano which must be extinguished," "the gangrene, which must be burned out with the hot iron," "the hydra with jaws open to swallow up the social order." He was the prophet of "the reconstruction of the social order" and a "durable peace based upon a just division of power."

The Revolution gave birth to new ideas which ought never to have come into the world. Prevention of the spread of these new ideas was, he felt, the imperative need of politics. His strength lay in the fact that repose was the passionate desire of men. Nothing seemed more fearful than a recurrence of war.

He failed in the end because, while he could imprison revolutionists, he could not imprison ideas. He failed to understand the impalpable forces of his age.

His concrete task was to defend his treaty-making work, to consolidate that work, to repel all attacks against it. He saw only one side of the Revolution, the destructive. The constructive side he never understood. This, however, was for the future more important. A comprehension of it was most important for a statesman who felt the world resting on his shoulders.

To achieve his will he used his own remarkable powers of persuasion, suggestion, intimidation. The system he created, at war with human nature, at war with the human spirit, rested upon a meddlesome and ubiquitous police, upon elaborate espionage, upon a vigilant censorship of new ideas, which was applied to theatres, newspapers, books, schools, and universities. The frontiers were guarded that books of a liberal character might not slip in to corrupt. Political science and history practically disappeared as serious studies. Spies were everywhere, in Government offices, in places of amusement, in educational institutions. Particularly did this Government fear the universities, because it feared ideas. Professors and students were subjected to humiliating regulations. Spies attended lectures. The Government kept a list of books consulted by professors. Text-books were prescribed. Obviously under a system where there was no freedom of teaching or of learning, science withered. Intellectual stagnation was the price paid.

The best possible protection for such a system was to extend it to other countries. Citizens could not travel to foreign countries without permission of the Government, which was rarely and reluctantly granted. The country was sealed as hermetically as possible against the liberal thought of Europe.

The appearance of revolutionary ideas and programmes in other countries became the signal for "intervention." The steps to combat liberalism formed landmarks in the history of peoples. All professors and students were watched by special agents whose function was "to observe carefully the spirit which is shown by instructors in their public lectures and courses, and to give a salutary direction to the instruction, having in view the future attitude of students." It was provided that all teachers who should "promulgate doctrines harmful to the public order or subversive of existing governmental institutions should be removed from their positions, and that, once so removed, they should not be appointed to any other educational institution."

A special commission was created to ferret out all secret revolutionary societies and conspiracies that might threaten the nation, and the commission was to have full powers to examine and arrest any citizen. It discovered very little, but it pursued for years a policy as vexatious as it was petty.

The persecution of "demagogues" was a sorry spectacle, as it was in reality a persecution of men who should have had all honors shown them as national heroes. They were subjected to the inquisition of the police, fined and imprisoned, only to be discharged because nothing could be found against them meriting punishment. Their houses were searched, their papers ransacked. Murders, assassinations, and attempted assassinations, explosions of infernal machines killing innocent people were associated with liberal teachings with which they had nothing to do. Suppression and repression were increased. One official discovered in the expression, "That lies beyond my sphere," revolution. Sphere meant a ball. A ball meant a bullet. Was not that a summons to insurrection and murder? Private letters were systematically opened by the police in the search for some trace of revolution. For years patriotic citizens had to experience these invasions of their private rights.

This verdict of history may be commended to Thought-Controller Burleson, to those who are about to vote for the Espionage Law, to the Board of Education of the City of New York, to the Union League Club, to Archibald E. Stevenson, to the Department of Justice, to the National Security League, the spiritual child of the "Society of the Avenging Angels," in its mad hunt for liberals; to all those who come under the Nazarene's curse on those who stand before the gate of knowledge, who will not enter in themselves, and who prevent those who are about to enter in. For the verdict of history is rendered to show us where and when men have failed and why they have failed. And the above is a real verdict of history pronounced by Charles Downer Hazen, in his "Europe Since 1815," upon Metternich and the system which he created and enforced in the so-called "Reconstruction of Europe after the Congress of Vienna."

This system prevented republican revolutionary ideas from controlling the Central European nations. It put back upon an absolute throne Ferdinand of Spain. It caused for thirty-nine years a continuous series of insurrections and revolutions throughout Europe. It was the occasion of the Monroe Doctrine—the challenge of our New World to Metternich's system—our declaration that these United States would not tolerate this sort of thing on this side of the Atlantic Ocean.

The system did not work. The impalpable forces of the human spirit would not permit it to work. The people rose against Metternich. To continue the literal quotation from Professor Hazen's book: "The crowd surged about and into the imperial palace, and invaded the hall in which the Diet was sitting, crying 'Down with Metternich!' Metternich, who was the very source and fount of reaction, imperturbable, pitiless, masterful, was now forced to resign, to flee in disguise from Austria to England, to witness his whole system crash completely beneath the onslaught of the very forces for which he had for a generation shown contempt." Then it was he said: "My mind has never entertained error."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Plot Against Mexico—I

By L. J. de BEKKER

IS there a plot against Mexico? I believe that there is, and that it involves several high officials of the United States Government; that its object is armed intervention in Mexico, on some pacific pretext, the real purpose being permanent military occupation of the country, so that its internal affairs may be administered in accordance with the interests of the conspirators. I believe that the originators of the plot are American oil men now operating in Mexican territory, or else greedy for an opportunity to begin operations there upon terms of their own dictation. I am aware that there exists a formidable publicity bureau created to poison the minds of the American people against Mexico, and that the publication of the truth regarding that unfortunate country will result in *The Nation's* being deluged with letters of denial, of protest, of personal vilification and abuse. Proof is difficult—unless undertaken by an official commission empowered to compel evidence—and the evidence is largely circumstantial. But there is enough to justify such an inquiry, if only as a means of preventing a war of invasion.

American and British oil interests in Mexico are centred in Tampico, in the State of Tamaulipas, but extend south along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico to Tuxpan, in the State of Vera Cruz. Seeing only Tampico, the visitor to Mexico would be impressed by the extent to which American influence has grown. This ancient Mexican port has developed into a second-rate Key West. It contains some tall buildings, and the only hotel in Mexico of the many in which I sojourned where the "scarlet creeper" is cultivated. Seeing only Tamaulipas, he would be convinced that the chief products of Mexico were oil and bandits, and would have registered the superficial impressions by no means uncommon among certain classes of commercial tourists. But having overlooked the cities of the Central Plateau, he would be ignorant of the real Mexico, and unable to contrast the peace and prosperity of the country, where the rule of the Constitutionalist authorities is supreme, with the devastation and anarchy wrought by bandits in the districts policed by "General" Pelaez on behalf of the oil men. In this land of contrasts Tampico is and always has been loyal to the Government established in Mexico City, and so are and have been the greater part of the political districts of Tamaulipas. The State Government has its seat at Ciudad Victoria, a town some distance from the port, and the governor, Dr. Osuna, who was at one time a Presbyterian missionary, possesses as complete an organization as can be found elsewhere; but nowhere else in Mexico outside Villa territory is there such chaos as in parts of Tamaulipas.

A topographical map would go far toward explaining these contradictory conditions. In Tamaulipas as in Vera Cruz the descent from the cool country of the Central Plateau to the *tierra caliente*, or hot land of the sea-coast, can be accomplished in a single day. A chain of mountains blocks access from the interior to the coast, and to the average traveller there are but two routes open to Tampico, one from San Luis Potosi, the other from Monterey, which lies to the north of the former city—both cities on the direct line of traffic between Laredo and Mexico City. Other routes available for horsemen and pedestrians are known to the natives, whether bandits or *pacificos*, but have no commercial importance. Choosing the southern route because it was closer to Mexico City, I left San Luis Potosi at 6:30 a. m., bound for the oil fields. On the Vera Cruz line to the capital, and throughout the network of roads I had traversed in Central Mexico, Pullman cars were in use, and travel was in all respects as comfortable as in the United States; perhaps more so, in our days of congestion and Government control; certainly more agreeable than my rail journey from New York to Key West a few weeks earlier.

There were no Pullmans on the roads leading to Tampico. Pullman cars are expensive things, difficult to replace, even in these days of reconstruction, and "King" Pelaez of the oil fields considers it a patriotic duty to blow up any rolling stock belonging to the Constitutionalist Government, regardless of injury to the passengers, who are robbed, if still alive after the destruction of their train, and may enjoy the felicity of seeing whatever of their belongings the bandits have discarded burned while they await the means of returning to civilization.

In the most dangerous places on this dangerous journey, one of Mr. Carranza's soldiers found the cowcatcher a seat of honor from which to scan the track ahead for evidence of dynamite. His life and ours depended upon the accuracy of his vision. Two soldiers, swinging out from either side of the engine-tender, watched for broken rails, open switches, wrecked culverts, or other proof of a recent visit from the Pelaez following. And whether danger was apparent or not, one soldier stood, carbine in hand, on top of a baggage car which contained half a dozen of his fellows, ready to reply to fire from ambush, or take a pot shot at any bandit rolling rocks down upon us from the steep mountain side.

The beginning of the danger zone was marked in a most extraordinary way. Certain bandits who ventured from the hot lands or mountain fastnesses, where they can hide more easily than upon the open plain, had been captured and hanged to the telegraph poles. The bodies, when we saw them, appeared to have been mummified in the dry pure air, and swung to and fro in the breeze in a state of perfect preservation—except as to clothes. Neither I nor the good lady who looks after me is bloodthirsty, but we had heard so much of the frightful crimes committed by these Mexican bandits who style themselves patriots, revolutionists, and sometimes Villistas, that I confess we tried, not without success and a certain grim satisfaction, to photograph five of these cadavers.

As we ran into the hill country, valleys of wonderful beauty and fertility opened before us, and despite unsettled conditions shown by ruined villages and churches and the grouping of thatched huts as close as possible to the tracks, we saw that planting had been resumed in many places. The mountains did not lift their heads into the region of perpetual snow, and there was no such glorious giant as Orizaba towering above us almost the entire day, as when we journeyed from Vera Cruz to Mexico City; but we saw sheer walls of rock, like a greatly magnified palisade; vast heights, so nearly perpendicular that we wondered how the verdure clung to them; and rifts and chasms so deep that, after a glance, we instinctively drew back into the car. Creeping at a snail's pace along a narrow shelf of rock, we saw suspended from a spur nearly fifteen hundred feet

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

below us a train of oil cars. These tanks, of course, and the oil they carried were the property of the Tampico oil men, but apparently they were en route to the wicked Constitutionalist authorities in Mexico City; so "King" Pelaez of the oil fields, who guards the jungle for the oil men, dynamited them—perhaps mistaking them for passenger trains.

We reached Tampico at midnight, several hours late, and with a prejudice against "General" Pelaez. I had been told by the American Embassy in Mexico City that the oil men paid Pelaez, for guarding their interests, $200,000 a month. Still, I was surprised to learn from the spokesman for the oil interests next day that they would like to see Pelaez President of Mexico, because he was their friend, and the only friend they had, as they were "in bad" with the Washington as well as the Mexican Government. Only a few months ago Pelaez was content with $40,000 a month blackmail, but the *Saturday Evening Post's* articles on Mexico got into his hands, and he "raised the ante."

Two years ago Pelaez and his staff lived at Terra Armenia, the big oil camp belonging to "El Aguila," otherwise Lord Cowdray's Mexican Eagle Company, and were represented by "General" Enriquez at Juan Casiano, the biggest of the camps owned by the Huasteca Petroleum Company, of which the founders were E. L. Doheny, and C. A. Canfield, of Los Angeles. The "Generals" were not at home during my visit to Tampico, having been dispossessed by President Carranza's soldiers some weeks before; so I did not have the pleasure of meeting them. But the oil men spoke highly of them, and it may be that Pelaez is dearer to them because he costs them more. Carl Ackerman was more fortunate than I, two years ago. "Who is Pelaez?" he asked in Tampico. "An ignorant Mexican rancher," was the universal reply. "He is a revolutionist, like all of us, against the Carranza Government. He has a loyal army that protects our property and workers. Pelaez is king of the police in the oil districts." "And Enriquez?" Ackerman questioned. "A Mexican doctor," answered the foreigners, "cultured, educated and refined. He had a drug store in Tuxpan." ("Mexico's Dilemma," p. 80.)

Unable to meet the "King of the Oil Fields," I said to the oil men: "Why don't you shut off this blackmail and make your peace with Mr. Carranza? No doubt your stockholders could use to advantage the $200,000 a month you are giving Pelaez, and he doesn't seem to be delivering the goods." "We can't," was the invariable reply. "He would blow up our wells if we did. Besides, the State Department at Washington knows each and every payment we make to Pelaez, and approves it."

Of course a guard of United States marines would cost these gentlemen nothing. That is the first incentive to the plot against Mexico—extrication by armed force from a difficult situation—and at the expense of the American nation rather than of themselves. And there would be money in it! American oil men profess not to have made a cent in Mexico in years, although Lord Cowdray's company paid a twenty-five per cent. dividend last January, and the Dutch Shell has paid thirty-seven per cent. and forty-eight per cent. in the last two years. How much money? I cannot state exactly, but one item of economy would be the export tax now levied on petroleum by President Carranza's Government. According to official Mexican figures, this tax amounted for the year 1918 to $5,560,198.95 in American money. The total value of petroleum exports for that year was 141,557,553.20 pesos, the peso being legally fifty cents American, although usually a trifle more valuable in the exchange. Exports might be increased and taxes eased off by American intervention.

Official Mexican figures show that twenty-four oil companies own their land in fee simple and pay no rent. Fifty-four companies pay an annual rental of less than five pesos ($2.50) for one hectare (two and one-half acres). These companies occupy nearly seven-eighths of the oil land under exploitation. The total area rented by them is 3,325,490 acres, out of a grand total of 4,064,870 acres. On this they pay an annual rental amounting to $589,320.54, or a little more than ten and a quarter cents per acre. Twenty-two companies pay annual rentals of less than $5 per hectare upon 138,340 acres, amounting to $166,254.84. One hundred and twenty-two companies pay more than $5 per hectare. They occupy 175,087 acres and pay a total annual rent of $2,443,457.72. Several companies pay from $500 to $2,016 per hectare, which raises the average, so that on the total acreage, as stated above, the total annual rent is $3,449,033.22. Both rentals and tax rates are lower than in Texas or Oklahoma, but under American intervention they might be still further reduced.

The Mexican Secretary of Commerce and Industry estimates the value of all oil properties in Mexico at $300,000,000, one-third of that sum being allotted to the wells. But in 1915 the Huasteca operators reported to their stockholders a physical valuation of lands at $75,000,000, and have since increased their acreage. Other estimates, some by Americans, place the value of foreign oil holdings at one billion dollars. A stake worth playing for? But that is not all. Only the surface of Mexico's wealth in petroleum has been exploited as yet.

Americanism in North Dakota

By W. G. ROYLANCE

IN a recent article in *The Saturday Evening Post* Emerson Hough expresses the opinion that Americans know little about America. Mr. Hough has become widely known to the reading public through his novels and outdoor stories and his delightful portrayal of the pioneer life of this country. No one has a better claim to the title of American. But Mr. Hough, after relieving himself of this choice bit of wisdom, proceeds to make himself a shining example to prove the truth of his own philosophy. He assumes the superiority of Americans over the hordes of immigrants from the old world who, according to him, are so great a menace to America and her institutions; but nowhere does he distinguish between Americans and others. He paints a dark picture of the dangers to American institutions from the infusion of European radicalism; but does not point out the characteristics that distinguish European radicalism from honest American progressive democracy. True, he enlarges upon the menace of the I. W. W.; but, as everybody knows, that organization had its birth in this country, out of distinctively American conditions. He also points out that Bolshevism was born in this country and carried to Russia by its authors, Lenine and Trotzky. He does make one definite statement, squarely off his own bat, when he says that the House and Senate of the North Dakota Legislature were controlled by the Non-partisan League; but he immediately falls back upon bald assumption when he says that "everybody knows, or ought to know, that that means Europe is in the saddle."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Is it possible that, in spite of his general vagueness, Mr. Hough has actually run the "European menace" to its lair in North Dakota? Not in the East Side slums, nor in the Irish section of old Boston, nor in Pittsburgh, nor in the copper mines of Montana, Utah, or Arizona, where Greeks, Italians, Austrians, Croats, Slavs, Finns, and Letts slave and sweat in the mines, but in the clapboard farmhouses of one of the greatest prairie States, where but yesterday the American Indian hunted the buffalo?

It must be admitted that if North Dakota is Europeanized, and if Europeanization is destructive to Americanism, then Americanism is in very grave danger indeed. But we can hardly agree that "everybody knows, or ought to know," that the Non-partisan League control of the Legislature of North Dakota means that European ideas dominate the politics of North Dakota. Our respect and liking for Mr. Hough are not great enough to induce us to take his bare statement on so grave a matter.

Whatever valid criticism may be made of the North Dakota Legislature or the legislation enacted by it, it cannot truthfully be said that the men of most influence in it are un-American, in ideas or tendencies, or that the methods used or the laws enacted are un-American in character or purpose. The president of the Senate is an American of New England stock; the speaker of the House came to North Dakota from the South; the chairman of the Senate committee on taxation and revenue is a descendant of Irish chieftains, but is nevertheless a thoroughly Americanized Irishman; the chairman of the House committee on taxation and revenue is named Bryan, and he is American-born; the chairman of the committee on appropriations is the shrewdest and canniest of Scotch-Irishmen, and Senator Cahill, of the State affairs committee, is also of Irish extraction, but they are Americans, for all that.

Of course, there are German names on the list, and it must be admitted that the majority of both houses are of Scandinavian origin, some having been born in America and others in the old country. To be sure, all of these men, or their near or remote ancestors, came from Europe. Possibly Mr. Hough would hold that that means European control. If so, by that same token, the Declaration of Independence is a European product; the convention that framed the American Constitution was dominated by English and French ideas; the first American President and the first American Congress were influenced by English traditions and dominated by English precedents; and every American generation throughout our national history has been bound to Europe with ties that could not have been severed, even had we wanted to sever them.

The Non-partisan League itself has in its membership not only all these elements, but many "poor whites," a few Negroes, and native Americans of pre-Columbian ancestry. The League organization itself has been shown to be a revival of populism; and populism was born in Kansas, of a parentage whose ancestry may be traced back through Shays's rebellion, Concord and Lexington, and Wat Tyler's revolution, to Wyclif and the Lollards, in that most English of all English uprisings of the people against industrial and ecclesiastical despotism.

But our super-Americans say that the Non-partisan League is socialistic—that it is even Bolshevist; that it is a soviet, aiming to foist upon the innocent farmers of North Dakota the red revolutionary methods of Lenin and Trotzky. What is the truth? The League in North Dakota represents the organized revolt of the farmers, who make up a majority of the population, against long-continued exploitation of financial Shylocks and marketing profiteers. The farmers, however, have made no attempt to exclude all other than League members from participation in the government of the State. They have simply pooled their votes, and used them to elect representatives who would carry out their political and industrial programme. If that programme includes the socialization of farm credits and, to an extent, of farm markets (and this the League farmers do not deny), it is because they think that all other methods of loosening the grip of the credit and marketing monopolies have been tried and have failed. Negotiation, after the manner of the trades unions, has failed; political dickering with the interests that controlled the State has failed; coöperation has measurably failed, waiting for a greater degree of success upon the establishment of a government responsible to the will of the people.

Every step in the political advance of the League in North Dakota has been peculiarly and distinctively American. By standing together in the League the farmers secured control of the machinery of the Republican party—to which most of them already belonged; they carried the primary elections; they organized their campaigns strictly along tried and tested American lines, but much more effectively than the "old gang" political bosses were able to do it. They elected their candidate for governor and a majority in the House of Representatives in 1916, but failed of a majority in the Senate, with the result that they were able to make only a bare beginning toward the carrying out of their programme in the session of 1917. In the 1918 elections they obtained control of all branches of the Government. In the meantime the farmers found their attempts to secure economic justice hampered by antiquated constitutional provisions, many of which had been written into the constitution at the dictation of special interests, and thereafter interpreted in their favor by the courts. They then proceeded to amend the constitution, in the manner prescribed by that instrument itself—by the pooling of their votes. They broadened and made effective the initiative and referendum provisions; thay removed restrictions that had made it impossible for the people or their representatives to reform an antiquated and unjust tax system; they brought the courts and the Legislature within the control of the people; they transformed North Dakota into the most advanced type of American commonwealth advocated by progressive American writers; but they did not introduce a single European feature. They did, on the other hand, throw into the junk heap a quantity of worn-out devices for defeating democracy, many of which date back to feudal times. They made North Dakota the most American state in the Union, and when the Legislature convened at Bismarck last winter, the farmers had in it an American majority, elected by American methods, pledged to enact laws to meet American conditions.

What was the method adopted in making these laws? The anti-League press thought that it had scored an important point when it gave evidence to show that some of the bills considered by the Legislature had been drawn up at the headquarters of the League in St. Paul, by "experts from outside North Dakota," that is, from other sections of America. Neither the farmers nor the men in their employ deny this; but they do deny that there is anything un-American or in any way reprehensible about it. The

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Non-partisan League makes no attempt to disguise the fact that it maintains a bureau for that very purpose; and the farmers much prefer to have laws drawn by experts in the employ of their organization, rather than by corporation lawyers in the employ of the industrial and financial monopolies from which they are struggling to free themselves.

At the beginning of the session the majority members organized a caucus and appointed a steering committee, and a cry of pretended indignation went up from the opposition press. One would have thought that all the mysterious horrors of "Red Russia" were embodied in those erstwhile favorite devices of American legislative majorities. The League management moreover assembled for the assistance of the caucus and the steering committee the very experts who had already been working on the bills. They did this without any disguise or pretence. Worse yet, lobbyists appearing before legislative committees, after being accorded a hearing, were sometimes referred to one or the other of these experts for the working out of amendments desired by them, and thus was prevented the combination of several interests for the defeat of a measure against which in many cases none of them urged other than minor objections. Honest lobbyists, honestly intent upon preventing legislation unfavorable, or securing the enactment of laws favorable to legitimate interests, actually liked this method. As one of them remarked, "It gets you somewhere." At any rate it is a distinctively American development of traditional American legislative methods. Who ever heard of a caucus anywhere but in America? Or a steering committee? And the lobby we have always with us, a necessary American evil, if you will. If the farmer legislators of North Dakota have discovered a method of dealing with the lobby in the open, why should not that too be placed to the credit of American democracy?

"But the North Dakota Legislature enacted the Non-partisan League programme of State socialism, whereby the State is to run a bank, grain elevators, flour mills, and packing plants. And socialism is un-American." Early in its history the Federal Government established and maintained the Bank of the United States, the plan for which was drawn up by Alexander Hamilton. Was Hamilton a Bolshevik? Washington himself favored the bank. Is it possible that even the First American, if living, might be in danger of being indicted under the espionage laws "with more teeth in them," so vigorously advocated by Mr. Hough? The State of Louisiana owns and operates the port of New Orleans, including the largest cotton warehouses in the world, and a grain elevator, from which ocean-going ships are loaded. Kings County in the State of Washington owns and operates the port of Seattle, which not only has elevator and storage facilities, but where fish are packed, hay is baled, and other food products "processed" or re-conditioned. Are these socialistic? And must these two American States also be classed with North Dakota as States dominated by European methods? The Government of the United States has established the first national system of farm credits known to history, and in spite of the most strenuous opposition of a nation-wide organization of farm-loan sharks, that system is already a proved success. Are the federal farm-loan banks socialistic and "un-American"?

The greatest danger that the North Dakota farmers' movement is likely to encounter is that the farmers, like other majorities, may become intolerant of the wishes and regardless of the rights of the minority. Even that, however, would be no ground upon which to convict its people of un-Americanism. The majority now in control in North Dakota is giving many evidences that the evils inherent in majority rule will be in the near future greatly mitigated, if not entirely corrected, as democracy advances nearer to the realization of its purposes—the assurance of political, industrial, and social justice to all men. And democracy is in the saddle in North Dakota—not socialism, communism, or any other old-world political or industrial theory, but American democracy, carefully and courageously adapting American methods to the solution of American problems.

If North Dakota fail, it will be a failure of American democracy. And if American democracy fail by peaceful adjustment to establish industrial and political justice, that failure will be in large measure chargeable to the advocates of the use of autocratic methods for the discouragement or suppression of such democratic movements as that initiated by the farmers of North Dakota.

The Pleasance

By ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN

THE tropics flame and run over with flowers of every hue, profuse in the richest variety; but few imagine that Flora can be prodigal of her favors in the temperate northern lands. Her reign is so brief in Ultima Thule, for a summer of two months or little more; what can she accomplish in the time allotted? Is it possible that she can be lavish in quantity as in quality of her gifts, in color, and in perfume? Then she is an outcast divinity, poor Flora! The thrifty farmers of The Valley will have none of her in their well-tilled fields; so she takes to the highway perforce, like any gipsy. But even turned vagrant, she still reminds all who care to look that she is a goddess, entitled to reverence, working her unconsidered miracles along her narrow, grudged domain, and turning roadside and field edge and right of way into wild gardens.

To the farmers of the Valley the alder is a pest. It seeds and spreads like a weed. The thriftless overgrown bush flourishes in the rich soil as well as the profitable apple-tree, and must be fought down with the axe in frequent onslaughts. None the less, the nuisance is a picturesque nuisance, for it runs in lines of green, framing the fields with hedge-rows, and turning the rolling country under Blomidon into the semblance of an English shire. And the alder is a close ally of Flora's.

The Lower Road curves along the edge of the old salt marsh. It is a utilitarian thing of man's devising, to give access to the beach from the main highway. Here the alders have had their will for years, triumphing over the farmer, and they have turned it into a green lane with branches meeting overhead. The teams drag down the heavy timbers for the shipyard from the mountain to the beach, but they cannot be seen, only heard, in their passage through the leafy screens of the Lower Road. At the shore end, for reasons of their own, the alders have fallen away and given Flora a chance to exercise her skill. The farmer had ceased to persecute, and the Flower-Goddess seized on the empty space to turn it into a delight, her own private parterre.

She kept first place for her eldest favorite, the wild rose. On both sides of the road are beds and banks and thickets of roses, lusty, impenetrable green brakes, sown thick with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pink moons and stars and crimson spars, according as the flowers are in full bloom, or in bud, or just unfolding. In the dewy morning, the warm evening, the summer noon, when the interfering winds are still, the rose thickets flood the air with indefinable sweet.

This wilding must be the original, the mother of all the voluptuous garden roses with names almost as beautiful as themselves. It is a simple, single thing, five petals about a yellow centre. The color varies from deep crimson in the shadow, or, when the rose first opens, to the ghost of a pink that is almost white, for the sun which glorifies also bleaches. The yellow centre is large in proportion, a rounded group of stamens and pistil, representing in one more form the everlasting mystery of sex and the reproductive process, Erasmus Darwin's "youths and maidens." There is something passionate and royal in this arrangement of floral crimson and gold, which suggests why the imperious, hot-blooded House of Tudor has the rose for its emblem. When the wild rose droops, the petals fold back into the square conventionalized form familiar to the artist. A rose garden has always been the peculiar desire of kings and sultans and lovers of impossible luxury; and here is one of Flora's own planting, more subtle in design than mortal gardener ever planned. And the gate stands open day and night to all who choose to enter in.

Flora is almost as fond of yellow as of rose color. She has a spendthrift's love of gold, to fling about. Treading on the heels of the wild rose comes the golden-rod, showing summer the door and ushering autumn in. Flora planted it by sheaves and armfuls, wherever root would hold. The sturdy crowds of it edge into the alders and almost shoulder the rose-brakes to one side. At first they stand in masses of verdant plumes; then gold dusts the green feathers; then they look as if Midas had touched them. The golden-rod is all kinds of gold. It shapes as spires and spikes and filigree and bullion and lace. It gleams, or shines, or glitters, or glows as if molten, according to the accidents of light and its relation to the gazer's eye. Such largess Flora scatters with a full and unwithdrawing hand for the benefit of any wayfarer.

The golden-rod is the showiest flower in the garden; it is gorgeous to behold, but it has one great fault—it gives forth no more sweetness than the precious metal that it mimics. That office is taken over by another yellow flower, the common evening primrose. Unlike its English cousin, it does not court the ground; it pushes forth from the sides of a tall stalk, like a many-branched candle-stick, lighting the gloaming with pale yellow fire and pouring out delicate incense.

Another regal color which Flora much affects is purple. The philosopher, the poet, the mystic, and the lover all complain that language breaks down in the effort to cope with their emotions and their thoughts, but not more than the plain pedestrian scribe, whose only aim is to set down the natural fact as he sees it. Purple may mean anything. It is a blanket term for combinations of red and blue; but the proportions may vary infinitely; the shades, grades, and variations run through an endless gamut, and yet they are all purple. The vocabulary of odors is equally stricken with poverty. The scent of roses, the breath of new-mown hay, the reek of wood smoke on frosty air, to name only a few—how they appeal to the sense and excite the brain! Each gives pleasure and sets trains of thought in motion, like music, and yet there is no language to render clear their subtle assault upon the human personality. An aroma, which is the flower's soul, can awaken the whole anthology. And what is perfume? Infinitely little particles flying off continually into the air, tickling human nerves, affecting the strange machinery of the human brain, and attracting bees and moths! Another of the fairy tales of Science! Another of the impossible tasks of Art!

But Flora's love of purple! Beyond the roses on the Lower Road is a plantation of scented purple thistles, which vie with the roses and the evening primrose in pouring out perfume. They are tall, handsome, *noli-me-tangere* fellows, like the Scots Guards. Nor are they as malicious in disposition as most thistles, for the farmer excuses himself from cutting them down by declaring that they do not spread. There is something masculine in their donative of scent.

Rose and gold and purple against masses of green was Flora's color scheme for this wild garden. She tamed it with white of yarrow and boneset and pearly everlasting and Queen Anne's lace, which is more like floral jewel-work than lace. At the edge of the road under the alder bushes she set out an ornamental border of pigeon-berries. The flat leaves look like a tesselated pavement setting off the cluster of scarlet berries in each plant. In and out she wove long trails of pink-and-white convolvulus, and scattered purple spikes of heal-all, at random along the edges of the Lower Road.

So Flora made her garden long ago and opened her gate to all comers. Boy and Girl accepted her tacit invitation with gratitude, and, in the long summer twilights they made the pleasance their own. Girl's hair is turning gray, and Boy halts in his gait, but Flora's wild garden can still awaken in their hearts the melodies of spring.

Foreign Correspondence

The Jews in Poland

(*By a Special Correspondent*)

Warsaw, May 27

THE Jewish problem has been haunting me all through Middle Europe. I shall be an expert on this question if on no other before I return—which will be an acquisition of perhaps doubtful value. In its essence, the Jewish question is the minority problem in its purest and simplest form. If any race has proved the axiom that you cannot assimilate a minority by force, the Jews have proved it. They do not, like most other Mid-European minorities, live on and cling to the land. They are city dwellers—usually of all people the most easily assimilated. Yet centuries of oppression have driven them only more closely together and kept their individuality alive. Naturally, like all Mid-European majorities, only to a greater extent, the Poles continue blindly to pursue the old vain course of trying to assimilate them by persecution, that is, by extermination; but the truth is that the way to "assimilate" a minority people, in this sense, is to lift them to the rank and prosperity of the "upper classes." They will promptly begin to do exactly what our own "upper classes" do, go in for the one-and-a-half-child family. I may add, perhaps, by way of parenthesis, that I am sending this suggestion for embodiment in the declaration on minority rights soon to be issued by the Conference at Paris: "All minorities to be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wiped out by a system of subsidies to promote well-being of said minorities and so reduce their birth-rate."

The money for such purposes ought not to be difficult to find. The Poles are finding all sorts of money for very much more short-sighted objects. They are recruiting a tremendous army in order to conquer new minorities clustering around the oil-wells of East Galicia, Bolaslav, etc., or around the coal mines of Silesia or the primeval forests of Lithuania. It is the same story. The attitude of the Poles towards their newly acquired subject peoples is the same as their attitude towards the Jews. "Assimilate and conquer" is their motto. The Empire of the Jagellons must be recreated at all costs. An elderly Polish prochovnik (I frankly confess I use this sort of thing in order to establish my local color with the least possible trouble) in the train from Lwow to Przsemysl, nearly had an apoplectic fit explaining to me what the Poles would do in case the Allies didn't let the Poles keep Lithuania and Eastern Galicia and the whole of Silesia. "Damme," said he—and he reminded me for all the world of old Major Pendennis—"Damme, we'll fight them all. I admit that ninety per cent. of the population of Eastern Galicia is non-Polish. But the culture of Eastern Galicia has always been Polish, and its traditions."

Scientists and physicians who diagnose a disease are supposed to keep their temper. One does not get angry with a germ. One tries to find out how to kill it through scientific means, and so to save his patient. One tries in the same spirit to view the Polish-Jewish situation. The pogroms which have raged throughout Poland and which in various degrees of seriousness still continue, the undoubted and terrible maltreatment of the Jewish population, the constant petty persecution, even in Warsaw, the Government discrimination and refusal to permit Jews to hold Government positions, and finally the boycott, are symptoms of a serious disease. These are the Polish symptoms. What are the Jewish symptoms? A sudden development of an intense Jewish-nationalist spirit. The Poles have driven the Jews, as the English drove the Irish, by oppression, to make certain unusual and rather extravagant nationalist demands. That is to say, a certain part of the Jewish leaders demand national Jewish autonomy within the Polish state. Prilutski is the leader of these. He is something of a fire-eater. His election to the Seim (Constituent) has just been annulled on some technicality by the courts and now he will pose as a martyr. Many of the Jewish leaders refuse to support Prilutski's programme, and are satisfied with cultural autonomy for the Jews. But, generally speaking, the developments of the last few months have awakened a new sense of solidarity in the persecuted minority.

Both parties, in addition to these particular symptoms, suffer from a common psychic illness, a distortion of normal mental processes. The Jewish problem obsesses everybody in Poland and cripples every move to found a new state. Three million Jews cannot be left out of the reckoning or be plunged into misery without such action having a profound effect on the whole body politic. You can scarcely converse with anyone for five minutes without bumping up against this ugly question. It is a running sore. You see it everywhere, in the bread lines, where Jew and Christian stand in separate lines, no less than in Parliament, where there is a continuous war between the ten Jewish delegates and the other three hundred odd.

The case against the Pole is fairly clear. He has acted insanely. Partly the fault lies in the weakness of the Government, which has not been able to control the peasants and the soldiery. On the other hand, it is the very Government officials—to speak frankly, Paderewski himself, and others like Dmowski—who have fostered anti-Semitism until it has outgrown their control. Why should the press go on as it does—even the very organ of Paderewski's own party? The people of Middle Europe still read their newspapers seriously, and believe what they read in the editorials. The action of the press, accordingly, has great bearing on the situation.

On the other hand, the Jew, partly as the result of outside pressure, has generally maintained his separate identity. He walks the streets of Warsaw in a long black coat —a survival of the caftan—and a little black cap with a small visor, somewhat like that of an engine driver in our country. The mere fact that he is identifiable at a distance even augments the possibilities of persecution. His intellectual separatism is equally clear. He has become a stubborn particularist even with regard to his own people. The factionalism of the Jewish people here, the hair-splitting of political beliefs, passes the understanding of a simple American brought up in the two-party procrustean bed of politics. Only in one thing are all except a small fraction of the Jews united—in standing at bay against their Polish brothers. For brothers, or at least neighbors, they must continue to be, despite all quarrels. And the question arises as to what can now be done from the outside to create the possibility of a life side by side. Within the country there does not seem to be sufficient political wisdom on the part of the governing classes to reëstablish peace.

The remedies which a mere tyro would suggest are as follows, and I give them with due modesty:

I. Immediate economic relief. Intimation to the Polish Government that all help will cease to come from the Entente unless physical persecution ceases at once. The stationing of American officers where Jewish suffering has been greatest, to see that promises are carried out.

II. Threat of trade and financial boycott unless the Polish Government at once makes the following promises:

(a) Public declaration of disapproval of persecution and boycott of the Jews. Immediate passage of laws making punishable attempts to boycott the Jews.

(b) Proper representation of the Jews in the Seim.

(c) Special Jewish schools during the transition period.

(d) A court of appeal in the League of Nations, with power to protect litigants pending litigation, to which the Jews, as well as other minorities, can appeal freely upon any reasonable cause.

Contributors to this Issue

L. J. DE BEKKER is a newspaper man and the author or editor of several books. In 1916 and 1917 he was staff correspondent of *The Evening Post* in Cuba, Haiti, and Porto Rico. Last winter he went to Cuba and Mexico as editorial correspondent of the *New York Tribune*.

ARCHIBALD MACMECHAN is professor of English Literature at Dalhousie College and is well known as a scholarly writer and editor of books in his field.

W. G. ROYLANCE is connected with the National Non-partisan League, with headquarters at St. Paul.

OSWALD W. KNAUTH, formerly of *The Evening Post*, was an officer of artillery in France.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reflections After Discharge

By OSWALD W. KNAUTH

DURING the war some of us have been in fortunate positions which made it possible to learn about movements in strange and interesting corners of Europe; others have travelled much, and fathomed the mind of the poilu, the Tommy, or even the American doughboy; but most of us have done nothing except petty jobs since the war began, and look back to a dreary succession of mud, rain, darkness, and misery. Our one thought is that this might really be the last of war; that what we went in to achieve might not be lost through selfish bickering. And yet to see the military mind at work fills one with grave doubts as to the future. The gulf is so deep between the military and the civil point of view that the former is almost incredible to the ordinary civilian unless he has had an opportunity to see it manifest itself with unfailing regularity on the part of all varieties of military people under every type of condition. Once recognized and analyzed, it runs astonishingly true to form.

Just what are its main features? They became familiar to us during the controversy with Germany, which finally forced us into the war, but they have become more sharply defined through close contact during actual operations, because even a war for democracy must be fought by military men and with military methods. First of all, the military mind sees no shades; everything is either white or black. A gun is either clean or dirty; equipment is either one hundred per cent. serviceable or condemned; a job is either done or not done; the soldier is either fit for duty or sent to the hospital. Civil life, on the contrary, is constantly concerned with grades and judgments; failure and success are comparative, being tempered by a thousand and one considerations, and final judgments are withheld until the correct shades can be determined. Indeed, it is often interesting to see how concessions to this attitude creep involuntarily into military life, despite the most rigid efforts to exclude them. Closely connected with this is the ideal of no discussion. Orders are orders, and must be obeyed as such. Most of the actual work is done in ignorance, without knowledge of its relation to the larger whole, on the theory that when everything functions as it should, there is no need for such knowledge; if the high command has planned and thought out everything in advance, no amendment need be considered. How far this ideal falls short of the reality is but too familiar to those who have met suddenly changed conditions, and have been forced to make ignorant decisions. A battery commander is ordered to take up a new position before dawn, and be ready to open fire; he finds the road blocked, and at dawn is still on his way. Shall he go into position where he is, or struggle on by daylight? This depends on the comparative value of keeping hidden, or of attaining a certain point at any cost, and the battery commander finds himself without data for such a judgment, owing to the military theory that orders are to be carried out as given. The human reaction to this attitude is the growth and spread of the wild rumors that are constantly circulating; nothing is known so anything will be believed.

Efficiency in the army is maintained chiefly by punishment. Perfection is taken for granted, and every shortcoming, beyond the petty offences handled by company punishment, can be pigeon-holed in its correct place by reference to the Articles of War. The dominant factor in holding the soldier to his work is therefore fear of a court martial, and his independent efforts are stunted accordingly. How far removed is this attitude from the modern commercial view of extra pay for extra work, bonuses, piece work, and other stimulants to effort! In fact, the military psychology is that which governed commerce a century ago, in the days of the Manchester economists, and from which competition has forced a steady development to our present attitude.

Yet everywhere, the military mind is obliged to adapt itself to reality. Soldiers have to be marked "quarters" for a day or two, until they are again fit for duty; personal initiative has to be stimulated by praise and privileges, as well as by fear of punishment; at times unforeseen contingencies are provided for by general instructions. But such concessions are made reluctantly, and the type of mind remains sharply distinct from that which serves the democratic ideal. How far has it impressed itself permanently on the American people? Has its dominance been for the period of the war only, with a stern resolve that while this was the only way to win the war, it is not the way to live? These are questions which time alone can answer. The military mind has had tremendous power, increased by the reluctance of liberals to take a part in the war; it now seeks to perpetuate this power by demanding universal training not merely for the sake of providing adequate defense, but for disciplining and changing the mind of the American people. War efficiency is held up as the ideal for peaceful happiness. Our nation before the war was far from satisfactory to persons holding such ideas; it was altogether too selfishly discursive, prosperous and independent. It must be moulded to efficiency, obedience, and sacrifice.

It is perfectly recognized that the military mind must be in control during a state of war, for only in this way can the immediate efficiency necessary to victory be attained. But while we surrendered to this control during war, we are now concerned with peace-time policies, and these must not be given over to military minds. The army has but one excuse for existence—success in battle; in every other way it is an anti-social force. It has been said that the stage of any civilization may be measured by its dependence on armed force, and this theory lies at the bottom of most of our pre-war policy. When our remarkable impotency before the war is recalled to us, we may do well to compare our present position to that of the thoroughly prepared Germany. That there is a certain risk in not being armed to the teeth at all times must be clear to the most ardent pacifist; but Germany has clearly pointed out the dangers of preparedness. Her splendid efficiency brought only temporary success, and bore within itself the seed of its own downfall.

The military and the civil mind were united in the prosecution of the war, but with different ends in view. Each hoped to use the war as a means of gaining the ascendancy. The struggle between the two is only now beginning in this country, and there can be no "straddling." If the world is to be so unsafe that universal training is necessary, then democracy is doomed. On the other hand, a reduction of the military establishment to the point of safety for defence may still give democracy the last word in determining our future policies. There is no more compromise with our military minds than there was with the military mind of Germany.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Through a Gateway in Japan

By WITTER BYNNER

A torii stood, three miles above the bay,
The gate of sacred ground,
And when I wandered through a little way,
I paused and found
No temple-steps, no lanterns and no shrine,
Only divinity—
The solitary presence of a pine
Facing the sea.

In the Driftway

THE kneeling multitude chanted at dawn in the shadowy gold temple: *Namu Amida Butsu.* Before the lotus-crowned altar rows of gorgeously apparelled priests recited the sutras. The Drifter studied the serene faces of the priesthood. One figure stood out in sharp contrast to his colleagues—tall, angular, pallid, with light eyes, amid a world of black ones. The Drifter guessed he might be an Irish-American, but if so, how came he to be a Shinshu priest in Buddhist Kyoto? After the service, the Drifter, wandering through the cool rooms of the great temple, met the mysterious priest, eager to proselytize, but more eager to talk of himself. He claimed the distinction of being a man without a country, without enthusiasm for any of the three lands which gave him and his parents birth. He had sampled many countries and many religions, embracing each with fervor, only to denounce it later with corresponding violence. Now, at twenty-two, he was a Buddhist priest (of high rank, he assured the Drifter), eager to convert the world.

* * * *

THIS questing figure has again crossed the Drifter's line of vision, but so changed as only to be recognized by those strange light eyes that flickered palely with fanaticism. He is no longer a man-without-a-country—it may be that he put too great a strain upon the patience of the patient Japanese; at present he conceives himself a Britisher. Buddha is scrapped with Rome, his previous choice. He has now joined that voluntary brotherhood which finds its mission in scattering tales of atrocities. Being too recent a convert to have served in the Bulgarian and Belgian atrocity campaigns, he clothes his authentic horrors in Korean dress. How familiar the horrid story! "A missionary told me that a man he knew had heard—!" The young enthusiast finds ready market for his wares; he is an "authority," he tells the Drifter. He is still eager to convert—to something; still eager to talk of his many selves. Did such a youthful career perhaps develop the versatility of the Old Man of the Sea?

* * * *

THERE is a beautiful church uptown that the Drifter often goes out of his way to pass because it reminds him of certain old-world havens where long ago he "drifted" to some purpose. For an instant he has the old thrill, the old lifting of the heart in the presence of beauty that is warm with human feeling. But there is something wanting. About the portal are tabernacled niches intended to enshrine a company of saints; but they are empty. The armless, legless, noseless population that throngs the façades and portals of Chartres and Rheims is astir with life; but this church is dead. Is it a symbol? Has some spiritual Cromwell destroyed the very possibility of such life henceforth? Or are these niches expectant? Do they await new occupants in the days to come, and whom do they await? The Drifter would give something to see those niches—or what they represent—in a hundred years. We think we know all the tests of holiness, but a much wiser and better man than most of us once wrote:

Hid are the saints of God,
Uncertified by high angelic sign.

Perhaps they are all about us, the men and women who will be raised by Humanity to the honors of its altars in a hundred years. The ways of sanctity are strange.

* * * *

THE Drifter had one perfect day during his patriotic week-end. He woke immensely early to a morning full of birds on a rough hill sloping down from an old Berkshire farmhouse by many ways and windings to the devious Housatonic. He went dabbling on khaki knees among innumerable daisies and buttercups and black-eyed Susans to find enough wild strawberries for his breakfast, and ate them with reckless oceans of cream kept the night in a spring so cold that on the most tropic days vessels come up from it clouded and beaded. He neglected the newspapers all day, hoeing and joyfully baking in his garden in the confident expectation of a blessed reward. And then at six precisely, by the sun, not the clock, he slipped, with some splashing, be it admitted, for his dive was eager, into the cool, sweet, quiet, well-sunned, but still tonic waters of an unforgettable lake. Repaid by the first keen shock for the whole day's scorching, he shouted and plunged a little out of pure felicity, and then swam to a deeper pool he knows, where the water is never troubled and where now its crystal loneliness was broken by nothing but a few pink laurel-blossoms wind-shaken down upon it. Here he drifted, halcyon for that day, and waited. Not too late it came, the timid challenge, the flaunting confession, the liquid lament, the whistled prayer of the hermit thrush, pulsing through the replying air. The Drifter let the spell take him, and lay for a long while at the summit of rapture, not quite sure which was he, which was calm lake, and which was radiant bird.

* * * *

OF the many letters that pour in upon *The Nation* in the course of a single week, one has given the Drifter great comfort for the years to come. It reads as follows: "I've a hunch that when the proletariat takes the reins here, *The Nation,* if it be no more reactionary than it is now, will run little risk of being suppressed." This is really very encouraging. The Drifter had felt pretty dubious about his chances in the coming new organization of society in America, since *The Nation* is neither Bolshevist, communist, nor socialist, but this gives some hope that *The Nation* may receive credit for good intentions and well-meant liberalism, at least. But if *The Nation* is to be saved to the extent of just getting under the wire, the Drifter cannot help wondering what in the world will happen to *The New York Tribune,* for example. Will its advertising be taken away from it, in accordance with the plan in Bavaria, or will it be just simply closed up once and for all? It is an interesting theme for speculation, but the Drifter sleeps more quietly at night now that his future is assured. THE DRIFTER

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Correspondence

Mr. Cooper's Protean Trinity

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In *The Nation* of June 7, Professor Lane Cooper succeeds well in mingling scholarship and humanism without combining them. For Professor Foerster's "trinity" (dilettante, scientific investigator, and humanist) he substitutes this: "(1) the dilettante, or sentimentalist, (2) the pedant, and (3) the scholar, representing the golden mean—the investigating humanist." This trinity, however, is not three persons, but one god. The announced god of Mr. Cooper's idolatry, namely Number 3, is a composite and fluctuating figure. He shifts his shape, in a most unscholarly and confusing fashion, behind the clouds of incense with which Mr. Cooper surrounds him. Now he expands to include Aristotle and Milton. Now he shrinks off into the very un-Aristotelian and un-Miltonic pedant who regards independence of investigated subject-matter as an indispensable "test of intellectual independence"; and who submerges true literary and human values in merely historical or antiquarian values. From this form he shifts easily (page 913) into the dilettante or sentimentalist, who romantically lauds second-rate literature of the Middle Ages, and asserts that Cynewulf is "one of the six or seven great English poets." The one quality which Mr. Cooper's triune unity cannot assume convincingly, in spite of his "breadth of perspective" and smooth protean agility, is just the central one on which his divinity should depend: namely, a firm sense of comparative values. This is the distinguishing sign of humanism. It marks those great humanists whom Mr. Cooper cites because they happened to be also investigating scholars. It marks a host of notable humanists, including Shakespeare and Matthew Arnold, whom Mr. Cooper omits because they happened *not* to be investigating scholars. One is glad to note a limit even to Mr. Cooper's juggling with the term "investigation." Yea, and it appears also, if strugglingly, in many American graduate students of literature, for whom an increasing number of teachers and scholars (some of them in Mr. Cooper's own university) wish to provide the *option* of a training different from the type defended by Mr. Cooper. No wonder, then, that Mr. Cooper, refusing to face fairly the alternative plan of study drawn up by Mr. Foerster and me, twists our main purpose, absurdly misinterprets our provision in regard to "Anglo-Saxon," and dismisses as "surmise" our deductions from pressing facts. His vision is dimmed by worship of an impossible trinity. He obscures, for himself, the need of reform by trying to thicken the clouds of incense.

Bowdoin College, July 1 G. R. ELLIOTT

Black and White Psychology

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial, "The Negro at Bay," in *The Nation* of June 14, is significant not so much because it advocates the extension of constitutional rights to the Negro, but for the reason that it indicates and justly condemns the apparent "fighting" psychology of the Negro.

Led for the most part by "leaders" whose vision is circumscribed by the color line, and embittered by opposition and disillusionment, the Negroes, if their "fighting" psychology of today be translated into action, would be likely to direct the conflict not so much against the iniquities of the white race, as against the white race itself. Such an eventuality would inevitably spell disaster to the Negro; nor is it less certain that at this time the condition of one-tenth of a country's population must necessarily be reflected on the other nine-tenths of the people.

Washington, June 29 JEAN TOOMER

Invertebrate Pacifism

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: You did a service for your readers in printing (in *The Nation* of May 10) the address of the Rev. W. A. Smith, discussing the state of the churches, now that the war is ended. There is one cheering sign of the awakening of our people to a breath of truthful modesty. What else do we need so much? But why did the eloquent speaker, following the fashion of war time, need to hit out in passing at the lonely and unpopular figure of the "invertebrate pacifist"? Is vertebrate thinking common and cheap anywhere? Who can yet be sure that the pacifists, in their enforced aloofness from the hysteria of the war, have not thought straight? There is good authority to believe that superlative intelligence and sophisticated ingenuity are not essential to perceive the fundamental realities.

Now the pacifists have thought that, despite all appearance, this is God's world—a spiritual universe; that we men possess a spiritual nature. The open mind, the friendly temper, the cooperative enterprise, the good-will towards all are commanding laws in their life. The pacifists honestly believe (to use words lately quoted in *The Nation* from Sir Charles Addis, the London banker) that the Golden Rule is "the embodiment of sound practical common sense." They can see nothing "weak or unmanly in the Christian law of forgiveness." How then could pacifists join in an orgy of killing their fellows? Can the best nation (if there is a best nation today) carry on war without hate—without lying and blackening the character of the opposing nation? Must we be so false as to treat as enemies millions of men and women towards whom we cannot feel a tinge of enmity, but rather grief and pity? Must men be called "invertebrate" because they are unable to get away from these sequences of thought?

Look at the falsity and national shame of breaking our promises upon the basis of which Germany agreed to surrender. Look at the general willingness to compel the "enemy" to subscribe to a falsehood in accepting the whole blame for the war. Look at the cruel penal indemnity forced upon the Germans. We seem to have lost the fine edge of our sense of right and wrong. Must we move on to another war in order to learn the tremendous lesson that it is not enough to profess to hate an evil, that we must hate it so much as to forsake it and set good in its place!

Jamaica Plain, Mass., June 20 CHARLES F. DOLE

Michelet and the Treaty

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: The following passages taken from Michelet's "History of France," Ch. 3, Book 15, may prove of some interest to your readers, in the light of the present treaty arrangements. This treaty was with the Duke of Burgundy, who took the city of Liège in 1465.

"The oppressive treaty of 1465 had been drawn up by 'two grave clerks,' Burgundians, who accompanied the Count in his campaigns—Master Hugenot, Master Carondelet. These able men had forgotten nothing; nothing had escaped their knowledge or their foresight; not one of the exceptions of which Liège might have taken advantage—not one, a single one apart, namely, that it was utterly out of the power of the Liègers to fulfill its stipulations.

"They had started from the principle that *the loser ought to pay*, and that *he who cannot pay ought to pay more*, discharging over and above the debt the expenses of the seizure. Liège was to give so much in money and so much in men, who were to pay with their heads. But, as the city did not wish to deliver up heads, they valued these heads at a money value—so much for my lord of Burgundy, so much for my lord of Charolais, in order to satisfy all the demands of justice.

"The fearful amount was to be liquidated by half-yearly

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

instalments of sixty thousand florins each, payable at Louvain. . . . The exasperated population, unable to take vengeance on others, wreaked it upon themselves. They became hardened and cruel; and their demagogues familiarized them with executions, to which women crowded as well as men. It was found necessary to raise the scaffold higher, so that none might complain of not enjoying a good sight."

Minneapolis, June 29 OBSERVER

Russian Six and One-Half Per Cents

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I note with much interest your comment upon the non-payment of the Imperial Russian Government 6½ per cent. three-year credit. There are several points in connection with this which possibly may not have come to your attention. The Protective Committee which has been named includes, as you state, the usual names. In fact, the Committee simply consists of the representatives of each of five banking houses which originally brought out the loan.

The bonds were due for payment on June 18. As late as 3 p.m. on June 17, I was advised by one of these houses over the telephone that they did not as yet know what would be done with regard to the payment of the bonds and that an announcement would be made on the next day. The evening papers of that day, however, and those of the next morning contained a statement to the effect that they would not be paid, and a statement dated the 17th was mailed to reach the bondholders' desks on the 18th. Needless to say, in order to prepare and print this statement, the banker in question must have been aware, several days in advance of the maturity of the notes, that they were not to be paid. Evidently, from the letter of the Acting Secretary of State, that department of the Government was also aware that these bonds were not to be paid, yet the bondholders could not by any means secure information until the very day that these bonds were due. The opportunities for speculation that this gave to those who were favored with this information in advance of this time are quite obvious.

It seems to me an unspeakable condition whereby information of this kind is kept from those interested, and imparted only to a few who may thereby be enabled to take exceedingly good pecuniary advantage of it.

New York, July 1 HENRY J. ECKSTEIN

The Problem of Americanization

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I venture to say that no definition of Americanization would be acceptable which did not emphasize the deep-seated love of country. If this is true, one specific problem in the process of Americanization will be: how shall this essential quality or attitude be secured? There is reason to fear lest some of our self-appointed Americanizers may show more zeal than discretion, and thus become workers of serious mischief. As a timely reminder, therefore, permit me to quote the following passage from a volume by Edwin Lawrence Godkin, the founder and former editor of *The Nation:* "We are the only great nation in the world whom people try to preach into patriotism. The natives of other countries love their country simply, naturally, and for the most part silently, as they love their mothers and their wives. But to get an American to do so he has, one would think, to be followed about by a preacher with a big stick exhorting him to be a 'good American,' or he will catch it. But nobody was ever preached into love of country. He may be preached into sacrifices in its behalf, but the springs of love cannot be got at by any system of persuasion. No man will love his country unless he feels it to be lovable; and it is to making it lovable that the exertions of those who have American patriotism in charge should be devoted."

Chicago, Ill., June 15 C. H. IBERSHOFF

Heckling the President

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I suggest that liberals, the country over, courageously determine to introduce, from the very first speech of Mr. Wilson's announced itinerary, the honored democratic policy of heckling. If he is asked questions, he will have a chance to speak *to* the people and defend his actions and policies in a way that making formal addresses *at* people whose minds he does not know will never serve. This would be fairness toward Mr. Wilson. If, by countenancing police interference, he shows that he does not care to speak to "the people," but only deliver polished orations to cheering crowds, we may draw what conclusions we will.

Honolulu, June 17 JOHN LOUIS HORN

The Minimum Wage

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me to say a word in reply to your correspondent, Eli Yates, in the issue of June 7. He asks that wages of labor be classified so that no injustice be done the super-skilled workman.

The trade unions thought they had settled that point long ago. They do not want to do an injustice to the super-skilled workman or the employer. All they ask is a minimum scale, which they figure is a living wage. Taking the minimum scale as a basis, the employer can grade them up to his heart's content. The union's business is done when the minimum wage is agreed upon.

Brooklyn, June 14 GEORGE L. FALLON

An Occasional Bright Side

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: If all the thoughts of the world's pessimists could be rolled into one, they could scarcely represent *The Nation's* outlook on the world. It is indeed surprising that it has any outlook at all, so dark apparently are the glasses through which it looks. *The Nation* justly enjoys a good reputation for publishing facts. In addition its style is of a high literary order. Facts and a pleasing style are admittedly valuable assets of any paper, but we cannot forget that they are merely the technical means for attaining the real end of the paper, which is to interpret public events in a rational and fair manner. Neither of these could be well attributed to *The Nation.*

It is true that the paper gets the facts, but to say that its interpretations are fair would be rather far from the truth. To be always fair there should sometimes be a bright side to a question.

Boston, June 21 H. M. PARTINGTON

Out of the Unknown

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Do you know what *The Nation* is to me? A cup of clear fresh water to one who is dying of thirst. A new hope and a new faith to one who has been sick with despair and disgust. Do you know what it means to one who is about to lose all confidence in humanity to hear a voice like yours? It means that there still is, after all, honesty, fairness, and goodwill to men on this wretched earth—and particularly in these United States, which never have looked so cruel, so ungenerous, and so narrow-minded to me as now. I have never read *The Nation* without a feeling of deep gratitude for the refreshment and relief it gave me, and I know that there are thousands who feel as I do about it.

A VOICE OUT OF THE UNKNOWN THOUSANDS

East of Chicago, June 30

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Literature

The Greatest Living Man of Letters

Anatole France. By Lewis Piaget Shanks. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Co.

IT is appropriate at the present time, just as a fairly satisfactory English translation of Anatole France is nearing completion, that a sympathetic and authoritative critical estimate of that author should appear. More than the meagre praise of calling this book better than its predecessors on the same subject is due. Compared with it, for example, the booklet of Mr. W. L. George, published several years ago, seems like a perfunctory and pedestrian performance. Mr. Shanks writes with an enthusiasm which communicates its glow irresistibly to his readers. His general method is to interpret rather than to criticize, but he has a scale of values and does not hesitate to pass judgment where it seems advisable to do so. As far as possible, he lets the author speak for himself, for prudence no less than reverence requires that a writer so personal as Anatole France should not be freely paraphrased.

How is one to sum up such a Protean figure as Anatole France, who has been called with equal appropriateness "the genius of Greece made French" and "l'extrême fleur du génie latin"? The story of his mind's development is lucidly, perhaps a trifle too schematically, traced in the following words: "So, beginning with his heredity and early environment, we follow the poet and thinker through his first imaginative enthusiasm for science, until his belief in her dies away in skepticism and he returns to the world of poetry and art. After this conflict of youthful illusions, when a victorious intellect has rejected the faith and effort which its philosophy finds vain, comes the second phase: content now to enjoy his own talents, without attempting to coördinate them to any principle but style, the erstwhile Darwinian develops his skepticism philosophically in order to range more freely in the galleries of the past. This is Anatole France in his forties, dilettante and disciple of the later Renan. But he wearies in the Palace of Art, grows sick of self and eager for a stronger draught of reality. Hence the descent into the arena, provoked by the Dreyfus affair and the corruption of French politics: the idealist, the man of heart and imagination now dominates the *intellectuel.* Then comes the reaction, after less than a decade of contact with life—when the student realizes that man is not the reasonable creature he had imagined, but a selfish animal, bound by inertia and hostile to reform; and the genial irony of his forties turns to satire, ending in the sneer of a cynic who can only caricature humanity. Anatole France is then an idealist turned inside out by life, an inverted idealist like Swift in his last phase, distilling acid sarcasm until again he is swept from philosophy into action by the world war."

Is there, then, nothing constant in this changing kaleidoscope of phases and moods? Mr. Shanks, at the end of his book, is at evident pains to vindicate the fundamental unity and consistency of Anatole France's mind and temperament. "Take him in any of his phases, and you find, balanced or conflicting or dominated one by the other, his own basic elements: an imagination essentially romantic and a Voltairian keenness of analysis. And under all their changes of pattern plays the *sensibilité nerveuse* which he early noted in Racine: in other words the artist's temperament, vibrant and sensuous, richly responsive but a shade too delicately poised—a nature which after its first contact with life is bound to turn away from its ugliness to that softer reflection of reality given by literature and art."

If there is any criticism to be made of this admirable summary it is that it hardly brings into sufficient relief the crisis produced by the Dreyfus affair, which brought into Anatole France's later work a note of seriousness, even of bitterness, which was scarcely to be heard earlier. Doubtless the great war has been equally upsetting to a man who has above all things loved peace and sweet reasonableness. When it broke out, he wrote a letter urging his fellow-citizens to show moderation. Later, when the flood of German invasion was at its height, in utter exasperation he adjured his countrymen: "Tirez dans le tas." But the war is simply the culminating catastrophe in Anatole France's career. Little work can lie ahead of him. If we are to judge by his last-published book, "Le Petit Pierre," he will turn away from the appalling world spectacle of today to the tenderness of early recollection. For memory, he has told us, is also a divine muse.

Mr. Shanks rightly names Voltaire and Renan as the prime intellectual influences on Anatole France—Voltaire with his corroding wit and his sense of justice and Renan with his dilettantism, his religion of universal curiosity, spiced by erudition and guided by taste. If Anatole France at first seemed like his master Renan to believe only in irony and pity, the decisive moment of his life taught him to espouse the cause of justice with Voltairian ardor. A lesser affinity, but one easily perceptible in his later works, is that of Rabelais. With growing license he has displayed more and more the scholar's love of the scabrous. Though his epicureanism is essentially intellectual, it is indulgent to the senses and finds in the sexual passion a subject of amused curiosity. Here, too, he is an embodiment of the *esprit gaulois.* As a matter of fact, Anatole France is so universal in his sympathies that one may detect here and there resemblances to tempers and characters wholly opposed to his own. No one has passed more severe strictures upon the inhumanity of Pascal than this most un-Puritan of skeptics; yet it is like an echo from the author of the "Pensées" when we read: "Earth is only a grain of sand in an infinite desert of celestial worlds. But if men suffer only upon earth, it is greater than all the rest of the universe. It is everything and the rest is nothing at all." Similarly, though classical spirit and taste have kept him free from the "contamination" of the Northern literatures, they have not hindered him from utterances which sound strangely like the great Russian writers—for example, the words which he puts into the mouth of one of the characters in "Le Lys rouge": "Souls are impenetrable to souls."

Like most egoists (one would like to mitigate the word, but it is a true epithet) Anatole France does not succeed in creating characters. He can only incarnate himself. That he has three times done this with some completeness—in Sylvestre Bonnard, Jérôme Coignard, and M. Bergeret—is generally recognized. Mr. Shanks seems to feel a preference for Coignard, whom he happily describes as "unctuous and genially disreputable, a mellow rascal who through all his lapses never loses our sympathy." A defect in constructive ability is also evident. Though he has chosen fiction as the vehicle of his ideas, Anatole France has no gift for the architectonics of a novel. It is the realization of this lack which has made him prefer the short tale. Mr. Shanks in this connection calls deserved attention to the faultless technique of that consummate gem of short stories, "Le Procurateur de Judée," whose ironic unmaking of history is far beyond the reach of a Maupassant.

The present reviewer has sometimes wondered just how the attitude of Anatole France to the doctrine of art for art's sake could be properly summed up. 'He has told us that "In art everything that is not beautiful is false," and has added: "Ideas belong to everybody, but as a thought has no value save through its form, to give a new form to an old thought is art in its entirety and the only creation possible to humanity." At bottom he is a man who would rather feel than understand. But, as Mr. Shanks points out, he has a mind too intelligent and too probing to yield entirely to feeling; and so he has become an *intellectuel* despite the distractions of a temperament distinctly artistic. Yet his skepticism, which has been blightingly applied to science, history, and all the other constructions of the human mind, has never been used to blast beauty. "It

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is useless for us to see the nothingness of life; a flower will sometimes suffice to fill it to overflowing." That sentence might have been penned by an Arthur Symons, but whereas in his case it would be the true expression of a unified temperament, in Anatole France it is only the larger half of a duality in which the lesser part, the rebellious mind, would speedily rise to assert its claims.

On the whole, the perusal of this book leaves one with a sense of frustration as regards Anatole France. Life can hardly have brought happiness to this subtle skeptic. Mr. Shanks selects as his masterpiece "Le Jardin d'Epicure," which is a veritable breviary of black nihilism. It is probable that the thinking man tends always to become world-weary. But while most men find at least temporary anchorage in partial idealisms, nothing seems to keep this man from almost incessant drifting. Art, as we have seen, is for him no permanent haven. It is not even clear that he has an abiding belief in progress, which constitutes for many modern men a fairly workable substitute for religion. It is true that in the introduction to "Jeanne d'Arc" he affirms his faith in the advance of mankind, and the very title of his political and social essays, "Vers les Temps meilleurs" (1898-1906), makes it appear that he is at least a meliorist. But here again skepticism invades and undermines. He has no confidence in the natural goodness of man or in the efficacy of a return to nature, and his faith in reform through legislation is killed by experience. The only advantage he concedes to democracy is that it may diminish the chance of war; perhaps even that spark of faith is now extinguished. M. Bergeret, his later mouthpiece, voices this disbelief in progress in his description of the human herd: "Pecus is imitative and would appear more so if he did not deform what he imitates. These deformations produce what we call progress." In his dream of the future in "Sur la Pierre blanche" (one of the very few works where he attempts to be constructive), Anatole France observes slyly that the inhabitants of his Utopia are not happy!

Mr. Shanks passes in careful review all the works of his author. He does this insinuatingly and with much tact, thereby avoiding the effect of a catalogue. The novice will find here a storehouse of information discreetly offered, and the familiar reader will have his earlier pleasure renewed and strengthened. A word must be added in praise of his style. It gives one distinct pleasure to read these pages, which make up the best book in English on the world's greatest living man of letters.

Galsworthy and the New Hedonism

Saint's Progress. By John Galsworthy. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

IF there is one art form that can share with high poetry the Aristotelian praise of being more serious than history, that form is the modern novel. We often forget this amid the masses of false and unintelligent stories that the day brings forth for its brief use. But what would we not give to have such narrative interpretations of the dark and irrecoverable past as Paul Bourget's "Le Disciple," or Thomas Mann's "Buddenbrooks," or Arnold Bennett's "Clayhanger"? The eighteenth century made an admirable record of the outward gestures and immediate motives of man within the norms of a rigid social and moral order. But how much more searching are these modern narratives in their union of closeness with range; how they reveal the spiritual and moral atmosphere which we create or seek to change; how profoundly they move us by the unexampled concreteness and intimacy of their dealing with the very stuff of which our lives are made!

Mr. Galsworthy's development into a novelist of this high and serious type has been slow. His earlier books often give the impression of emotional sterility, of underemphasis through an excess of mere good breeding, of temperateness used to hide a lack of power. In his style, as in his whole literary personality, there will always perhaps be felt the absence of that tang of wildness that is inseparable from the largest art. But he has forsaken his too deliberate sobriety. Even in "The Dark Flower" there was a throb beneath the coolness of the surface. Since then the war has stirred him and shaken him, and neither the gentle modulation of his sentences nor his constant economy of emotional expression can silence the great and greatly human cry that arises from "Saint's Progress."

The story, as is fitting, is simple. There is no elaboration of plot, no reliance on surprise. Into the life and opinions of Edward Pierson, a middle-aged and widowed clergyman of the English Church, comes the great war. It does not come with an obvious violence; it causes the depths to tremble. For his younger daughter Noel, when her boyish lover is suddenly ordered to the front, gives herself to him on a night of insupportable magic and pain. The young soldier is killed, and Noel, like any girl of the people, bears a fatherless son. This alone Pierson could have endured with an unwavering Christian sweetness. What destroys the security of his inner life is that Noel is neither contrite nor ashamed. It is she who had once asked him: "Are all people dangerous who don't think like others?" The girl has a flame in her soul, the very flame that Pierson has always dutifully smothered within himself. Both she and her married sister are totally inaccessible to his consolations and wholly divided from his hopes. He is a child to them, a child given over to mystical and irrelevant dreams. It is they who face this world of death and annihilation and of yearning for a little sunlight before the darkness fails. Not only from the children of his own household, but from the people under his spiritual care, and from the confused rumor of the London streets, there arises to Edward Pierson that same stern and intense and almost Roman cry:

"Vitae summa brevis spem nos vetat incohare longam."

And that brief space of life which forbids the harboring of long hope must be filled with beautiful and poignant things even though all the immemorial virtues and commands be swept away. It is Leila, the excellent pagan cousin of Pierson, who sums up the larger and more modern implications of the ancient doctrine: "I think the most dreadful thing in life is the way people suppress their natural instincts: what they suppress in themselves they make other people suppress too, if they can; and that's the cause of half the misery in the world."

Finally that spirit which is so new and also, because it is native to man's heart, so ancient, steals into the consciousness of Pierson himself. A familiar choral passage from the "Hippolytus" of Euripides rings in his ears "and all that in life had been to him unknown, of venture and wild savor; all the emotion he had stifled; the swift Pan he had denied; the sharp fruits, the burning suns, the dark pools, and unearthly moonlight, which were not of God—all came with the breath of that old song, and the look on the girl's face. And he covered his eyes."

Mr. Galsworthy's new temper has sharpened his observation and extended its range. Unfalteringly in this book he sees beyond the moral gesture to the moral fact. Hence he has written pages not easily surpassed in their strong and earnest veracity. Such are the pages in which Leila closely examines herself and her life and comes to the bitter conclusion that time is putting a period to the adventures of youth for her; such is the passage in which the Belgian painter Lavendie—who recalls the Ferrand of "The Pigeon"—tells Noel why he cannot separate from his wife; such is the masterly rendering of the psychology of Pierson's congregation, whose "herd-feeling" of defence is changed into one of offence at the sight of Noel's quiet figure in the pew; such finally, in a gravely ironical vein, is the description of the politics, patriotic and international, of Edward Pierson and his brother.

At one point only does Mr. Galsworthy employ a device that

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

falls a trifle below the artistic austerity of this book. Like Sir William Cheshire in "The Eldest Son," Edward Pierson has just dismissed with a touch of harshness a girl who is to be a mother, when his own daughter appears on the threshold and announces that the girl's sin and fate are also hers. There is no other excess of pointedness in the even progress of the story. Nor is there any technical pedantry. Mr. Galsworthy several times makes slight changes in the personal angle of the narrative, shifting from Pierson to Noel, to Leila, and even to Leila's lover, Jimmy Fort, whom Noel finally marries. But the harmony of impression is wholly undisturbed. For the inner unity of the book lies beyond the firm coherence of its fable, and the interlinked fate of its characters, and inheres in the great, overshadowing mood out of which it arose.

That mood is different from any other which the war has hitherto projected into creative literature. We have had, from all countries, the sacrificial exultation of the first year; we have had the passionate anti-militarism of Latzko's "Men in War" and Barbusse's "Clarté"; we have had the raw if powerful propaganda of Blasco Ibáñez, and the glittering intellectualism and vague God-seeking of H. G. Wells. Mr. Galsworthy's mood will seem to many minds deeper than that of all these men. He has gone to the ultimate sources of human experience. The presence of death through the war has made him feel, with an impassioned keenness, its presence in all ages and in all the world. It has brought home to him the pitiful briefness of man's moment in the sun, and the monstrousness of creatures so placed denying themselves their warmest needs, their glimpses of beauty that perishes and delight that dies with the day, and tyrannizing over each other in the name of questionable opinions and empty theologies and unfounded cosmic hopes. Thus he has linked together a quiet and noble hedonism, born out of the sorrow and not out of the joy of life, with a wider vision for the moral freedom of mankind. He has allied a great tradition to a new world. And he has done so without a shadow of consciousness or didactic intention. From reality itself he has caught this dominant mood and embodied it in concrete and memorable forms. Hence his book is not only sound and fine art, but like all sound and fine art a record and a prophecy of the direction of human life.

A Good Mender of Bad Texts

Lewis Theobald: His Contribution to English Scholarship. By Richard Foster Jones. Columbia University Press.

THE department of English and Comparative Literature at Columbia University has added to its valuable series of monographs a study of the life and work of a well-known figure in scholarship and letters in the early eighteenth century, the first real editor of Shakespeare and the original hero of the Dunciad. The author has a twofold purpose: to give a biography of Theobald and to establish the thesis, originally suggested by Professor Trent, that the basic principles of critical editing in English were derived directly from the method employed by Bentley in the classics. This thesis, it is a pleasure to say, Mr. Jones has established beyond all reasonable doubt. In his chapter, somewhat unfortunately headed "The Rage for Emending," he points out that Bentley is universally recognized as the father of the modern school of verbal criticism and calls attention to the great scholar's genius in the difficult task of emendation. Bentley's immense learning, his power of organizing his materials, his strict logic, and minute accuracy, all contributed to make him *facile princeps* in this line. His method, pointed out on page 37 of Mr. Jones's book, is first to examine critically the supposedly corrupt passage together with the various manuscript readings and the previous emendations. When these have been dismissed as unsatisfactory, Bentley brings forward his own emendation, demonstrates that it will endure the various critical tests, grammatical, metrical, and historic, which have been already applied to prove the impossibility of the accepted reading, and clinches his argument by assembling parallel passages "in thick phalanxes." In spite of his arrogant temper, his passion for excessive emendation, and the contempt in which he was held by the dilettanti and men of letters of his day, Bentley's fame had reached its zenith at the time when Theobald turned his attention to the text of Shakespeare.

As Mr. Jones has shown, Theobald, himself a sound classical scholar, was well acquainted with the work of Bentley. Indeed it seems to have been a passage in Bentley's first great work "Epistola ad Millium," 1691, which inspired Theobald to turn his attention to the work of Shakespeare. He always mentions the great scholar's work with profound respect and often with high praise, though he was independent enough to revolt from Bentley's outrageous treatment of the text of Milton (see a hitherto unpublished letter to Warburton, p. 299). Theobald was the first student of Shakespeare to realize the striking similarity between the state of his text and that of the texts of classic authors (p. 173). Naturally and rightly, when he set himself to restoring the text of Shakespeare, he followed, as Mr. Jones has shown, the method employed with such signal success by Bentley and followed it with almost slavish fidelity. In one point alone he may fairly be said to have surpassed his master. Theobald was but a poor poet, yet like many a poor poet he had a genuine appreciation of poetic beauty, and this taste led him to maintain readings which had been rejected by former editors —he retained Hamlet's *sea* of troubles, for example, as against Pope's emendation, *siege*—and to introduce readings of such poetic charm that they have been recognized ever since as almost inspired corrections. Such for example are the famous "babbled o' green fields" in Dame Quickly's report of Falstaff's death, and the charming image of the rose dedicating its beauty to the *sun*, where all previous texts read the *same* (viz., to the air—R. & J. I, i. 158-9). Theobald's work, moreover, displays some of the characteristic defects of his great master's method; Bentley's dogmatism, excessive display of learning, and fondness for unnecessary emendation all appear in Theobald. The last chapter gives us an interesting account of the influence of Theobald's pioneer work in the eighteenth century. It is primarily to Theobald's scholarship and industry and to the reputation which in spite of contemporary hostility and later depreciation his work on Shakespeare achieved and maintained that the whole method of editing our English classics is to be ascribed.

It is impossible, unfortunately, to speak with equal commendation of the biographical section of this thesis. Theobald's early life is told in considerable detail, but little or nothing new is brought forward, and the same may be said of the account of his quarrel with Pope, in which Mr. Jones follows, with proper acknowledgment, the exhaustive work of Professor Lounsbury. An appendix contains a number of hitherto unpublished letters from Theobald, mainly to Warburton, from a manuscript in the British Museum. The brief characterization of Theobald on p. 215 is, perhaps, somewhat too flattering. Apart from his services as the first scholarly editor of Shakespeare, there is little interesting or attractive about Theobald. For a great part of his life he was a typical hack writer of the Grub Street school, pouring out ephemeral translations, poems, plays, and farces. He was involved in one or two affairs which have a very ugly look of literary dishonesty. After all his denunciation of Pope's work on Shakespeare, for example, he based his own edition on Pope's text and incorporated in it many of Pope's corrections without the slightest acknowledgment. He was a hanger-on of the great and a flatterer of the distinguished. There is something almost fulsome in his praise of Warburton's critical powers (p. 262), praise which is in striking contrast to his severe and wholly proper rejection of many of Warburton's suggestions when he came to publish his edition of Shakespeare. The gross injustice done to Theobald by Pope and the later critics of the eighteenth century has provoked in comparatively recent times an enthusiastic reaction in his favor, and Mr. Jones is wholly of the laudatory school of Collins and Lounsbury.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books in Brief

THE latest book on the rehabilitation of our disabled soldiers, Garrard Harris's "The Redemption of the Disabled" (Appleton), is of special value for its detailed information as to the exact workings of the plans of our Government for medical treatment, vocational training, and replacement in civil life. So far there has been a remarkable absence of publicity in this matter. Yet without widespread and enthusiastic popular support the scheme must inevitably prove a failure. The corner-stone of the whole system is the Federal Board of Vocational Education, a body founded before our entrance into the war for the promotion, in coöperation with the various States, of technical and scientific training. During the early stages of the war this board was of great assistance to the Government, training and placing in Federal service thousands of skilled operators and mechanics. So successful were its operations that it was plainly marked as the instrument by which the new policy of this country in regard to its disabled soldiers was to be carried into effect. Under this policy the old degrading and extravagant system of pensions is completely abolished. In its stead a system of compensation has been established by which a fixed sum is awarded to the wounded soldier or his dependents for any disability incurred during the war, from the loss of a finger up to total disability or death. But this is only the beginning. The Government has pledged itself not only to complete the cure, as far as possible, of the wounded man, and to furnish him with whatever mechanical appliances are necessary to supplement a lost hand, arm, or leg, but also to supply him with a free technical or professional training which will enable him to resume his position as an active member of society, allowing him at the same time a monthly compensation equal to his pay for the last month of the war. Moreover, at the close of such training the Government assumes the duty of finding a post for the disabled soldier, watches over him in the first period of his activity, provides the necessary medical attention in case of a relapse, and in case of an unavoidable failure on his part to perform his new duties satisfactorily, transfers him to a post for which he is better fitted. It is to be noted, however, that this training and replacement are wholly optional. No one can be drafted into the Government's schools. Furthermore, it places the work entirely in the hands of civilian administrators and instructors; not a vestige of military control is attached to the scheme. And finally, whatever results may be attained by this training (and the example of other countries, Canada in particular, shows that many a disabled soldier has been equipped for a more profitable career than he pursued before the war) there will be no impairment whatever of the original compensation allotted for the injury received in service. Here, in the matter of voluntary acceptance of the Government's offer of training, is, it would seem, the crux of the problem. Too many disabled soldiers will be naturally inclined through ignorance or idleness to accept the bare compensation allotted for their injuries, become dependents upon their families and friends, or clamor for increased pensions and a sinecure in the civil service. Public opinion must be aroused until it forces upon such men the realization of the fact that a man may be a "slacker" in peace as well as in war, and that the first duty of the soldier who has suffered for his country in war is to train himself to work for her in peace. And employers of labor in every rank, from the proprietor of a great industrial organization to the farmer looking for a new "hired man," must come to realize the duty and the opportunity of placing these victims of war in the ranks of industry. It is not charity that is demanded; it is, in the President's own words, "the payment of a draft of honor which the United States accepted when it selected these men and took them in their health and strength to fight the battle of the nation," a draft which must be paid with intelligence as well as sympathy.

COMPOUNDED of condemnation for the past and hope for the future is Charles Edward Russell's latest volume, "After the Whirlwind" (Doran). Mr. Russell, regarding the events of the last few years, the years of "the late unpleasantness," preaches the uselessness of hate, and the advantages of love finding practical expression in coöperation. He asks that we forgive the German people, coupling that plea with the reminder that our own escutcheon is not spotless—a reminder most necessary if we are to be saved from the spiritually devastating effects of the feeling of national moral superiority. "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. I have now certain visions of streets in Stepney and Shoreditch, Spitalfields and Whitechapel; of certain regions in Lawrence, Brockton, Lowell, and Pittsburgh. These are results of the same competitive system. Germany, gone mad for islands, markets, and dumping grounds on which to get rid of the Unconsumed Surplus that haunted her dreams, showed some other results. Is the difference great enough to justify us in a stiff-necked superiority? I think not. Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors. If we can be forgiven for Paterson and Ludlow we can certainly make up our minds to forgive the people that have followed to such a tragic disaster the system and conception of life most of mankind have followed with only less of savage energy and evil fruits." Those reactionaries who had hailed with such pleasure the announcement of Mr. Russell's resignation from the American Socialist party because of its anti-war attitude will find their glee resolve itself into a rather disconcerting doubt that perhaps Mr. Russell is still in the camp of the radicals, that perhaps he is none the less a radical because he does not happen to be a member of the Socialist party. For whether Mr. Russell is a member of the Socialist party or not, he is a Socialist by his own interpretation of Socialism, penned after he left the party: "If Socialism means anything it means democracy. If it has any basis, that basis is democracy. If it has any soul, any hope, any inspiration, they are democracy. No one has yet imagined a means by which Socialism could be put into operation except the means of democracy." And by democracy Mr. Russell does not mean political democracy alone. He means industrial democracy also, but he recognizes that the necessary step to the attainment of industrial democracy is political democracy; and as the German autocratic system made political democracy a mockery and industrial democracy impossible, it was to labor's advantage, from Mr. Russell's point of view, that the system and the ideas predominant in Germany should be forever suppressed by the use of the only weapon which the representatives of that system recognized, namely, force. Socialists who hold so tenaciously to the belief that, for labor, there is only one conflict, the class-struggle, should recall that Marx urged a declaration of war by England against Russia. Mr. Russell fondly believes, however, that in a world of republics war is impossible!

SIR GEORGE HENSCHEL'S reminiscences, "Musings and Memories of a Musician" (Macmillan), call up refreshingly the music-saturated Germany of his youth, when Bach and Beethoven were the gods of musical adoration. His Russia is the picturesque Russia of princes and steppes, his America is New York before the days of skyscrapers and Boston in its Athenian age; his England, Victorian. George Henschel was born in Breslau of Polish parentage. He spent his youth in the midst of the incomparable musical advantages of Germany in the middle of the nineteenth century. He visited England in 1877, and was "utterly fascinated by English manners, English life, English country, English Sundays, even English fog." England became his home, and he a naturalized citizen. He married Miss Lillian Bailey, a New England girl who had charmed Boston by her voice and personality before she became his pupil in London. Immediately after his marriage, Henschel was chosen by Colonel Higginson to be the first leader of the Boston Symphony Orchestra. For his three years of conscientious devotion to its upbuilding, America owes him a debt of gratitude. "Musings and Memories" is by no means an autobiography; but unconsciously

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Henschel reveals himself as the possessor of a kindly humor, a devotion to the highest ideals of art, a serene philosophy, and an endearingly beautiful spirit. His full and varied life as concert and oratorio singer, orchestra leader, teacher, and composer is used as a framework for memories of many countries and many friends. There is a marvelous absence of bitterness in the book, though some unfortunate musical critics do not escape derision. Henschel's musical gifts and his rare capacity for devoted admiration and sympathetic understanding brought him into relations with a wide circle of musicians, artists, and writers. The list of his friendships is one to fill the reader with envy—Brahms, Rubinstein, Tchaikovsky, Joachim, Clara Schumann, Jenny Lind, Ethel Smythe, Stopford Brooke, George Eliot and George Lewes, Browning, Huxley, William and Henry James, Harry Brewster, Henry Lee Higginson, Whistler, Sargent, Burne-Jones. He portrays each one of these vividly, though often in a few sentences. The one sentence quoted from Burne-Jones after the death of Morris is worth chapters describing their friendship—"I feel as if a wall I had been leaning against had given way." The picture of Rubinstein and Madame Schumann is inimitable. "At Madame Schumann's Anton Rubinstein entertained us with a recital of his experiences in the United States, where, once, somewhere out in the wild woolly West, a man, about an hour before the concert, had thrust his head into Rubinstein's room with the words, 'Don't you think, boss, it's about time to have your face blacked?' 'No, you didn't really!' gasped poor bewildered Madame Schumann."

AFTER two years of delay the Colonial Society of Massachusetts has issued the nineteenth volume of its transactions, covering the meetings of 1916-1917. The volume is bulky, and contains a great variety of material of many grades of interest—letters, diaries, contributed papers, and learned notes on matters connected with Massachusetts history. Among the minor articles are a memoir of Frederick Lewis Gay, the collector, and a report of proceedings at the dedication of the Hutchinson memorial doorway to the First Church in Boston, November 5, 1917, contributed by members of the Society as a deserved but tardy tribute to the memory of an honorable and much misunderstood colonial governor. The most entertaining contribution is that of the editor, Albert Matthews, on "Early Autopsies and Anatomical Lectures," among the notes of which we miss a reference to C. J. Hoadly's article on "Opening Kelly's Child," a discussion of one of the earliest post-mortem examinations in this country. The longest articles, taking up nearly half the volume, are a continuation of Professor Delabarre's historical account of Dighton Rock, a curious piece of archæological and antiquarian investigation, and Professor Andrews's essay on "The Boston Merchants and the Non-Importation Movement," with its supplemental reprint of "The State of the Trade," 1763, found by the author in the Connecticut Archives. This paper, which takes up 112 pages and is a contribution to the general history of the colonies, concerns a phase of pre-Revolutionary activity that up to the time of the issue of the paper as a "separate" two years ago had been largely ignored by students of the period. It brings into comparison the many aspects of the non-importation movement and analyses the conditions which led to failure, laying stress upon the general mercantile and financial situation during the years from 1760 to 1770 and the various antagonistic influences that were at work creating discord among the colonies. Perhaps its most significant aspect is the prominence everywhere given to the attitude and opinions of the merchants, who favored peace and reconciliation with England and opposed the efforts of the radical and mob leaders to force a breach by raising the question of constitutional rights and the issue of slavery versus oppression. The article ought to have some influence in showing how thoroughly unfair and one-sided has been the treatment in the past of the circumstances leading to our Revolution. But, unfortunately, the teaching of the Bancroft school will, we fear, continue to dominate the minds of the American public.

Music

The Bach Festival at Bethlehem

IT is in the first week of June that the music-lover goes to Bethlehem. That he should do so may seem strange, for when one hears of Bethlehem nowadays one thinks not of shepherds and stars and songs, but of shells and shrapnel and submarines. The echo of the cannon forged in its giant fires has been heard around the world. But the Bethlehem of the Steel Kings is not the real Bethlehem. For in spite of the multiplicity of its chimneys, the blackness of its clouds of smoke, the colossal immensity of its output, the Bethlehem of steel is but a thing of days. Who knows how long steel will reign, and who cares? But the real Bethlehem, founded on the dream of an old mystic, is the Bethlehem which will endure.

The roots of it run back to ancient years, to the days when von Zinzendorf started the Singstunde for his Moravian brethren. The settlement was hardly begun before they sent to London for a spinet and then for horns and violins and violas. The Bach chorales were commonly used in the worship of the great gray church about which the community centred. Here for the first time in America the oratorios of Handel and Haydn were rendered. Such a soil in time produces a genius. The Director of the Bach Choir, Dr. J. Fred Wolle, is such a genius. He was born in the old town, in ordinary generation from music-loving fathers. Bach came and blessed him in his cradle, and he has given his life to the study and interpretation of his music. On the foundations already laid he has erected his choir gathered from all ranks of the community, shop-girls and school teachers and steel workers and professional people.

A contrast strikes the visitor as he goes to Packer Church, where the music is sung. As he passes over the bridge from his hotel, there is spread before him the valley that shelters the steel works. The chimneys flame and the furnaces roar and the hammers pound. It is music, too, the mighty symphony of steel. But it is a passing phase of the world's music. Once its motif was stone, and then it was bronze, and now it is steel. But he is going to hear music of another sort, of an eternal kind. There on the mountainside, where the trees shut out the chimneys, and the quiet church shuts out the trees, he is to listen to choruses which tell, as only Bach can tell, of law and justice and God's mercy unto men.

The sessions of the first day were devoted to chorales and cantatas. The great Choir was banked high under the chancel arch, while the Philadelphia Orchestra occupied a temporary platform in front of the choir. The Director led without a baton, but every finger of his long white hands is a baton, and every unit in the Choir makes quick response. On the second day the mass in B minor was sung, the most wondrous choral work that ever was written. In it Bach has achieved the impossible. The chorus of the "Kyrie," with which it opens is like wave on wave beseeching mercy. It was as though the wailing of a world were voicing itself through the throats of the Choir, a world of broken ambitions, and ruined cities filled with wounded men and children fatherless and widows desolate.

The visitor goes away wondering what they mean who call Bethlehem the American Bayreuth. It is poles apart from anything that Bayreuth ever held. Bayreuth is the place where Wagner set Nietzsche to music. It is filled with sword motifs and fire motifs and other things we want to forget. We are hoping, in spite of intransigent peace treaties, that soon may dawn the day when the Rhine gold, the symbol of world power, may be sunk in the depths of the sea, where none may ever dream of holding it again. Bethlehem stands for other things, for Christ set to music, for beauty and order and law, for the realization of the peace of which the old dreamer dreamed when he began his little town among the hills. And not only music-lovers want these things; the whole world wants them.

WILLIAM E. BROOKS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Art

The Fine Art of Weaving

THE exhibition of rugs and textiles from Asia Minor that has just closed at the Pennsylvania Museum was in some respects one of the most important exhibitions held recently in this country. The one hundred and twenty velvets, brocades, and embroideries may have been surpassed by the Patterson exhibition of 1915, and of the hundred and twenty-five rugs no doubt some individual pieces were excelled in the Munich exhibition of 1910; but, taken as a whole, there is neither record nor memory of an exhibition of Asia Minor weaves so comprehensive, so varied, and so instructive. Once more the claim of old rugs to rank as works of art was impressively vindicated, and a public that too often identifies fine art with painting was here shown what sheer magnificence and what profoundly moving effects can be accomplished in mere wool, when gorgeous colors and abstract patterns are wrought and mingled by a master's hand. While a number of the lesser types, such as Akscher, Kirscher, Mudjar, Tuzla, Konia, Sivas, and Anatolian Kurd were either indifferently represented or omitted altogether, the more important types were out in great force. There were not less than six of the mysterious and dramatic Armenian carpets, a round half-dozen of the early Oushaks—justly famous for centuries for their sumptuous color and brilliant patterns—three of the rare and lovely Damascus or Saracenic carpets, while Holbeins and Seven Mountain Rugs, so-called, were displayed in a quantity both astonishing and unprecedented.

The catalogue of the rugs by Mr. Hamilton Bell was not equal to the occasion. Some of the pieces were not named at all, being designated by date only, while more than half of the rugs had no dates of any kind assigned to them. All the names were qualified by the prefix "so-called," except the Anatolians, which of all rugs most deserve that label. If we cannot assign rugs definitely to Ladik, Kulah, Ghiordes, Oushak, and Bergamo, then there is, indeed, an end to all rug-naming. Despite the latitude provided by the appellation "so-called," there were some definite errors in attribution. For example, several Bergamos were classified as Yuruk, and one magnificent and important carpet from northwestern Persia of the early sixteenth century was assigned to Oushak, despite the owner's contrary ascription. The date of one of Mr. Ballard's Ghiordes, one of the most important of all dated rugs, was given as 1644 instead of 1614.

The hanging of the rugs was most unfortunate. They were crowded closely together, which deprived them of the grandeur and nobility which the best of them display when surrounded by proper space. Against the background of green burlap, several of the finest pieces fairly died.

The individual honors of the exhibition rest squarely with Mr. Ballard. Not only did he furnish nearly two-thirds of the rugs exhibited, but his rugs were, for the most part, unsurpassed. It is doubtful if any in the world compete with them.

ARTHUR UPHAM POPE

Whatever book you want

Wanamaker's

has it, or will get it.

We buy old, rare books, and sets of books

NEW YORK and PHILADELPHIA

BOOKS OF THE WEEK

ESSAYS AND CRITICISM

Classical Studies in Honor of Charles Forster Smith. By his Colleagues. Madison: University of Wisconsin. $1.

Phillips, Walter C. Dickens, Reade, and Collins: Sensation Novelists. Columbia University Press.

Wilkinson, Marguerite. New Voices. Macmillan. $2.

HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

Benedict, Bertram. A History of the Great War. New York: Bureau of National Literature.

Dawson, William H. The German Empire, 1867-1914, Volumes 1, 2. Macmillan. $5.

Goodman, Paul. A History of the Jews. Dutton. $1.50.

Hazen, Charles D. Fifty Years of Europe, 1870-1919. Holt.

Parker, William B., editor. Cubans of Today. Putnams. $5.

Proceedings of the Society at its Sixty-sixth Annual Meeting. Wisconsin Historical Publications. Published by the Society.

Quaife, Milo M., editor. The Movement for the Statehood, 1845-1846, Vol. I. Constitutional Series. Wisconsin Historical Publications. Published by the Society.

Sully, James. My Life and Friends. London: Fisher Unwin.

Thomson, Ethel H. The Life and Letters of William Thomson, Archbishop of York. Lane.

Weill, Georges. Histoire des États-Unis, 1787-1917. Paris: Félix Alcan.

FICTION

Deland, Margaret. Small Things. Appleton. $1.35.

Galsworthy, John. Saint's Progress. Scribners. $1.60.

Hine, Muriel. The Hidden Valley. Lane. $1.75.

Ibáñez, Vicente B. La Bodega. Dutton. $1.90.

Morley, Christopher. The Haunted Bookshop. Doubleday, Page. $1.50.

Rinehart, Mary R. Dangerous Days. Doran. $1.60.

Sheldon, Charles M. All the World. Doran. $1.25.

Yver, Colette. Les Cousins Riches. Paris: Calmann-Lévy. $1.10.

PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Ackerman, Carl W. Trailing the Bolsheviki. Scribners. $2.

Bouilloux-Lafont, Maurice. Les Chambres de Métiers. Paris: Payot & Co.

Clark, Elmer T. Social Studies of the War. Doran. $1.50.

Frank, Glenn. The Politics of Industry. Century. $1.50.

Ioteyko, Josefa. The Science of Labour. Dutton. $1.60.

Ross, Edward A. What is America. Century. $1.25.

Véran, Jules. Et il ne Devait Plus y Avoir de Guerre. Paris: Payard & Co. $1.10.

THE WAR

Biddle, Charles J. The Way of the Eagle. Scribners. $2.50.

Husband, Joseph. On the Coast of France. McClurg. $1.25.

Whitlock, Brand. Belgium. Appleton. $7.50.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Marshall, Henry R. Mind and Conduct. Scribners. $1.75.

Moore, George F. History of Religions, Vol. II. Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism. Scribners. $3.

Thompson, Henry C. The Religion of Wisdom. Chicago. New Reading Publishing Co.

SCIENCE

Bond, A. Russell. Inventions of the Great War. Century. $1.75.

Coffin, J. H. C., and Collins, Elmer B. Navigation and Nautical Astronomy. Van Nostrand. $3.

Lepper, George H. From Nebula to Nebula. The Author.

NATURE

Yard, Robert S. The Book of the National Parks. Scribners. $3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

MISCELLANEOUS

Alexander, Jerome. Colloid Chemistry. Van Nostrand. $1.
Andrews, E. V., compiler. Dramatization in the Grades. Boston: F. W. Faxon Company. 50 cents.
Best, Harry. The Blind. Macmillan. $4.
"Bookman, The." Vol. XLVIII. Doran.
Cabot, Richard C. The Social Worker. Houghton Mifflin. $1.50.
Carter, Henry. The Control of the Drink Trade in Britain. Longmans, Green. $1.75.
Cattell, J. McKeen. Carnegie Pensions. Science Press.
Chamberlain, Allen. Vacation Tramps in New England Highlands. Houghton Mifflin. $1.25.
Cheney, Sheldon. The Open-Air Theatre. New York: Mitchell Kennerley. $3.
Colcord, Joanna C. Broken Homes. Russell Sage Foundation. 75 cents.
Collins, Nelson. Opportunities in Merchant Ships. Harper.
Don Marquis. Prefaces. Appleton. $1.50.
Goudy, Frederic W. The Alphabet. New York: Mitchell Kennerley. $5.
Hall, Fred S. and Brooke, Elisabeth W. American Marriage Laws. Russell Sage Foundation. $1.
Hoppin, Joseph C. A Handbook of Attic Red-Figured Vases. Harvard Press.
Koch, Theodore W. The University of Louvain and its Library.
Lillie, Frank R. Problems of Fertilization. University of Chicago Press. $1.75.
Lippincott, Horace M. The University of Pennsylvania. Lippincott. $2.50.
Mathews, Franklin K., editor. The Boy Scout's Book of Stories. Appleton. $2.
New York Times Index. January, February, and March, 1919. New York Times Co.
Osborn, Charles S. The Iron Hunter. Macmillan. $2.
Peacock, D. H. Life of Joseph Priestley. Macmillan. 75 cts.
Pearson, Arthur. Victory Over Blindness. Doran. $1.50.
Pictures of London. By Celebrated Artists. Lane.

The event of the literary season!

170 Chinese Poems

Translated by ARTHUR WALEY

¶ "No better translations have so far appeared of Chinese poetry. He has given the real feeling of Chinese poetry, its clarity, its suggestion, its perfect humanity. There is no other translation of Chinese poetry now available with anything like the merit of this."—*Amy Lowell.*

¶ "A magnificent volume, in contents and format. It isn't often a jaded reviewer is so forced to sit up and take notice."—*James L. Ford in the New York Herald.*

At all book shops, $2.00 net

ALFRED A. KNOPF, 220 W. Forty-second St., New York

LEO TOLSTOY'S

The Pathway of Life

In Two Volumes

Translated by Archibald J. Wolfe

"The PATHWAY OF LIFE" is Tolstoy's posthumous message to a war-torn suffering world. It is the Gospel of right living and right thinking and offers the great philosopher's panacea against world wars and misery, helping mankind to eradicate all those false feelings, desires and doctrines, personal, social, economic and religious, which are responsible for the present plight of humanity.

International Book Publishing Co.
5 Beekman Street, New York
Price $2.00 each volume

WHAT IS AMERICA?

***By* EDWARD ALSWORTH ROSS**

Author of "Russia in Upheaval," "Changing American," etc.; Professor of Sociology in the University of Wisconsin.

PROFESSOR ROSS always has something to say, and he knows how to say it. Following is his description of his intention in writing "What Is America?":

"Our society is developing as the fathers neither foresaw nor intended. Its path is determined chiefly by the instincts of multitudes —as in the westward movement and European immigration—by our inherited institutions, and by the remoter effects of mechanical inventions. In the course of this development strain is produced on a large scale. You cannot lay it to persons, it is simply a by-product of social evolution. Of course we should seek out a remedy, but, in the meantime, we need not begin to quarrel among ourselves and hate one another.

"The bulk of Americans well understand this. There are some who will do nothing about the suffering in the wake of social evolution lest their profits be disturbed. There are others who hold certain individuals responsible for this suffering and would wreck society in order to get at them. Between these are the steady-going millions who, without losing their tempers, seek patiently for remedies. They have contended with a long series of grave problems, yet have not turned bitter. They exhibit that 'firm adherence to justice, moderation, temperance, frugality, and virtue,' without which, according to the Virginia Bill of Rights of 1776, 'no free government, or the blessings of liberty, can be preserved to any people.'

"It is to vindicate and commend this 'virtuous democracy' that I offer this little book."

12mo, 150 pages, with numerous charts and graphs
Price $1.10

The POLITICS of INDUSTRY

***By* GLENN FRANK**

Co-author of "Stakes of the War," etc.

A BOOK that will help the alert American to anticipate and discount the social and industrial crises that are certain to develop in the near future. The papers that make up the volume are said by many business and labor leaders who have read them to constitute the sanest and clearest statement yet made regarding the social unrest, the labor problem, and the part American business men may play in this period of readjustment following the war.

The book contains the following five papers: A Nation of Improvisers; The Background of Reconstruction; Anonymous Liberalism; The Politics of Industry; Business Statesmanship.

The author says in his Foreword: "The statesmanship or stupidity of business men is of more social significance than the statesmanship or stupidity of politicians. The recognition of this fact brought an interesting task into my hands. During the past year it has been my assignment and my pleasure to try to interpret the mind and the attitude of the more forward looking business and industrial leaders of this country in relation to the social and industrial unrest and the pervasive spirit of change that marks our time. I have tried to catch their spirit rather than quote their words."

12mo, 214 pages. Price $1.50

At all bookstores **Published by**

THE CENTURY CO.

353 Fourth Avenue **New York City**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

International Relations Section

Vol. CIX NEW YORK. SATURDAY, JULY 12, 1919 No. 2819

The Economic Situation of Italy

By FLAVIO VENANZI

WHEN the armistice was signed, Italy, who had entered the war for the realization of a grandiose programme, was left in the most precarious condition imaginable. If the expression would not sound sarcastic in the present tragic situation, one might repeat the old Italian saying about the fifer who went to play and was instead played upon. People only now begin to understand that victories may have as fatal effects as defeats, and that pride, aspirations, rights, depend less on the conquest of coveted territories than on the upbuilding of industries and of all other factors of civilization.

Italy, because of her political, economic, and financial conditions, should never have been enmeshed in the European imbroglio. She lacked the modern industrial structure that could bear the tremendous responsibilities of the conflict. The short-sighted Italian statesmen thought that six months of blood-letting would be sufficient to put the country in the forefront of modern conquerors; and they accordingly plunged lightheartedly into the maelstrom of fire and ruin. But the war lasted seven times longer, and it was natural that the country should emerge in a worse condition than was expected. It was hard enough for all the belligerents to keep in the fight, but it was still harder for Italy, who had exhausted her military stores in the tantalizing Tripolitan war, had scanty means at home to replenish, and had to rely in a large measure upon her Allies both for military supplies and for the upkeep of economic life of the nation. It seems that Italian statesmen took no account of the political ferment brewing in the country in the years before the war and breaking out in open rebellion as late as the summer of 1914. The Italian Government succeeded in arousing the bellicose sentiments of the people by appealing to the old traditions of a dead greatness in the names of poets, painters, sculptors, architects, navigators, inventors, who were dead and gone and could not supply the coal, the iron, the gold, and all the other factors which make modern nations forge ahead and dominate.

They did not understand that it was a mere illusion to evoke the romance of great arts to the material development of the country, and that the dream of a great worldly conquest would turn into a nightmare. A dead past and an illusory future! Millions and millions of workers, crowding in a narrow strip of territory without sufficient natural wealth, found themselves in the toils of the competitive capitalistic epoch, and instead of being guided by the country's masters toward the solution of economic problems, reorganization, and readjustment, were compelled to work, to slave, to bleed, and to migrate, for the sake of an empty programme of greatness, consisting only of large and numerous battleships, a huge standing army, and unfounded hopes of expansion in Africa and in the Balkans.

The problems of internal reconstruction, of elimination of old evils, were sadly neglected; and most industries and enterprises were allowed to be initiated and managed by foreign capital. Belgium, England, France, and Germany were quite prominent in the development of Italy. The upper classes, by their indifference, ignorance, laziness, and snobbishness, were responsible for this state of affairs. During the war they denounced German penetration, as they denounce now the ingratitude of the Allies, but all evils which have fallen and continue to fall upon Italy are the consequences of their own short-sightedness and folly.

A few figures will demonstrate, more forcibly than words could, the utter failure and collapse of Italian finances. Let us cast a glance at the annual budgets from July 1, 1913, to June 30, 1918:

Revenues and Expenses (in lire) from 1913-14 to 1917-18

	Revenues	Expenses	Deficit
1913-14	2,523,000,000	2,687,000,000	164,000,000
1914-15	2,559,000,000	5,395,000,000	2,836,000,000
1915-16	3,733,000,000	10,625,000,000	6,892,000,000
1916-17	5,345,000,000	17,595,000,000	12,250,000,000
1917-18	7,680,000,000	25,339,000,000	17,659,000,000
	21,840,000,000	61,641,000,000	39,801,000,000

This table shows that the total revenue from 1913 to 1918 was 21,840,000,000 lire, whereas if there had been no war it could have amounted only to about 13 billion lire. There is a deficit in those five years of nearly forty billion lire.

Following the last accurate calculations of Maggiorino Ferraris, one of the most conservative and reliable statisticians of Europe, the debts growing out of the Italian war expenses up to October 31, 1918, were:

War Loan	Lire	
First, Second, and Third...	4,628,000,000	
Fourth	3,986,000,000	
Fifth	6,123,000,000	
		14,737,000,000
Quinquennial and triennial treasury bonds (5%)		3,052,000,000
Ordinary treasury bonds		9,240,000,000
Treasury bond and foreign debts.....		13,851,000,000
Notes issued by the Government (not including the Buoni di Cassa for 1 and 2 lire).....		2,046,000,000
Notes issued by the banks of issue for Government account		6,536,000,000
Total, lire,		49,462,000,000

and calculating an average expense of a billion lire from October 31, 1918, until June 30, 1919, a very low estimate, and three billion lire of extraordinary expenses, the total debt, including the pre-war debts, will climb to these enormous figures:

Old debts to August, 1914, lire.....	13,636,000,000
War debts to October 31, 1918.....	49,462,000,000
From October 31, 1918, to June 30, 1919.....	11,000,000,000
Total, lire,	74,098,000,000

EDUCATION LIBRARY

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One must not forget that this staggering total mortgages almost three-quarters of the national wealth of Italy, which is estimated at not more than one hundred billion lire. There are people who predict that before all European affairs are settled Italy will have to meet a debt of eighty billion lire.

We have seen that the budget of 1913-14 gave a deficit of 164,000,000 lire. Now, considering that the yearly expenses in the period before the war were not over two and a half billions, we have the following:

Yearly normal expenses	Lire
Annual expenses before the war.....	2,500,000,000
War pensions and subsidies.....	500,000,000
Increase of expenses from 1914 to 1920.....	1,000,000,000
Interest, 5% on 60 billions of debts.....	3,000,000,000
Total,	7,000,000,000

Let us see how Italy will collect the money to meet the expenses that amount in round figures to seven billion lire a year. During four years the revenues of the State were increased from the yearly normal pre-war amount of 2,245,000,000 to 4,596,000,000. But Maggiorino Ferraris maintains that these last figures will be only transitory for the period of the war; so we can scarcely rely on the four and a half billions that we mentioned. But even from this amount we must deduct many revenues that can no longer be counted upon; for instance, 500 millions of war-profits tax, 250 millions of luxury tax (that has already been abolished), and thirty millions export-license tax which will soon be abolished.

These great amounts were possible during the war only because of the great buying power of the State, and the increased internal trading; but when the country returns to the normal condition of production and commerce which did not give more than fifteen billions of aggregate income before the war, we will see the great disproportion of taxation on this amount. In fact, if the two and a half billions of revenue represents for fifteen million lire about sixteen per cent. of taxation which the Government raised before the war, it is not conceivable that in the coming years the country, with the same quantity of aggregate income, or the same capacity of production and commerce, can augment her taxation to reach the billions of lire which she needs to pay her debts and her increased expenses. It would mean a terrible burden of about fifty per cent. of taxation on all the incomes and outputs of the people of Italy. Added to the financial distress, we note the soaring price of necessities of life, that unscrupulous profiteers without any sense of justice or humanity impose on the lower classes. And the workingman, in order to dam the mounting tide of the cost of living, will ask better wages, will go on strike, and even resort to riots in the industrial centres of the country. So the relations between employers and employees will become more difficult and the *union sacrée* which was almost possible during the days of danger, will go to pieces under the hammering realities of the new peace. The Orlando-Sonnino combination, which managed to weather the storm of the war, even if it proved shrewd enough to obtain a new baptism of sympathy and confidence through a well-rehearsed raising of shields to the Paris conference, now has its back to the wall, and is unable to shape and realize all those reforms which could lighten the misery of the working masses.

The resolution of economic difficulties and the removal of unrest are the most pressing problems of the day; and the rulers of Italy, occupied with a boasting and empty nationalism, as pernicious as that of any other country, do not realize the tremendous tasks which are before them. The question of a general abolition of standing armies, a universal sinking debt at four per cent. among the Allies, proportionate to the wealth of each nation, even a universal lottery (!), as was proposed by a former Minister of Finances, Luzzatti, are very far from being practical. Unfortunately the forces which unchained all over the world the brutal monster of war are today incapable of settling their respective countries.

In regard to Italy, we find that she is in a worse plight than any other country. When the national wealth is mortgaged for more than three-quarters, and the people have not enough resources to extinguish or diminish the public debts, but must pay for their interest and for the increased expenses of the budget, no living man would dare to deny that such an economic and industrial situation bespeaks very dark days for Italy. So the country which entered the war to break the bondages of diplomatic and financial slavery of the central empires, and to redeem her sons beyond the Alps, having apparently accomplished these marvelous deeds, will be strangled in another way by her ruinous imperialistic policy. Whichever remedy the rulers of Italy will resort to, it will be a cajolery which the working classes, alert, watchful, anxious to apply their radical programme, will denounce as a policy of deceit and continuous misery for themselves and their kin.

The Second German Congress of Soviets

By EUGENE S. BAGGER

THE tendencies making for industrial as distinguished from a purely political revolution came to expression in Germany last fall through the setting up, mainly on the Russian model, of a large number of Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Councils all over the country. These bodies played an important rôle in the transition from the old to the new régime. It would be a mistake, however, to assume that these Soviets consisted exclusively, or even overwhelmingly, of partisans of the Soviet form of government—just as the Russian Soviets were not originally and necessarily Bolshevist. In fact, at the first Congress of German Workers', Soldiers', and Peasants' Councils, held at Berlin in the middle of December, the Scheidemann Socialists, at bottom hostile to the Soviet idea, preponderated. The hopes of the Independent Socialists and Communists for the immediate success of a dictatorship of the proletariat, as embodied in a Soviet republic, were shattered by the adoption by the Congress on December 16, of a resolution demanding the convocation of a national assembly based on universal and equal suffrage.

Notwithstanding this setback and the reaction aroused by the first Spartacist rebellion in January, the Soviet idea has eaten its way deep into the minds of the German working class, and a fierce discussion has continued in the Socialist press between the pro-Soviet Independents and the Majority Socialists, who, inasmuch as they have favored a council system at all, want one with a jurisdiction limited

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to purely "social" matters, a sort of extended trade unionism. The draft of the German Constitution, drawn up by Hugo Preuss in behalf of the Government, contained no mention of the councils; and the bitterness of the Independents increased.

On January 31, Däumig, one of the Independent leaders, presented a resolution to the second congress of the Soviets of Greater Berlin, declaring the Workers' and Soldiers' Councils "the agents of revolutionary success," condemning the proposed Constitution for failing to incorporate the council idea, and addressing a challenge to all Soviets in Germany to "fight shoulder to shoulder against suppression, open or secret." The resolution also demanded that a second Soviet Congress of all Germany be called. It was adopted by 492 votes against 362.

At the next congress of the Berlin councils, on February 28, Julius Kaliski, one of the most important Majority Socialist leaders, submitted a proposal demanding the "anchoring" of the council system in the Constitution, by coördinating a Chamber of Labor, built upon the Soviet system, with a Parliament elected by universal, equal, and direct suffrage. This resolution furnished the kernel of the scheme proposed by Kaliski five weeks later at the Second German Congress of Councils.

One of the chief reasons for the abortive general strike in Berlin from March 3 to 8, and the subsequent (second) Spartacist rebellion, was the dilly-dallying of the Government in regard to giving the council system a place in the Constitution; demand for which was by this time general even among the Majority faction. On March 3, the day the strike was called, the Government publicly promised to yield to the demand. Two days later the *Vorwärts* printed another pronunciamento, outlining the governmental plan for anchoring the council system. According to this and subsequent announcements, Article 34a of the Constitution would provide for the election of "workers' councils" (*Arbeiterräte*), endowed with rather amplified trade union functions. These councils would be in charge of general labor interests and welfare, and would have consultative powers in the management of enterprises. Furthermore, the proposal provided for "economic councils" (*Wirtschaftsräte*), in which workers and employers are to be represented "equally." These economic councils are to be charged with supervising production; they have the right to initiate legislative measures, but otherwise they do not infringe on the sovereign power of the political Parliament. The economic councils of the realm elect a central economic council, with jurisdiction over the entire country. This may be consulted in industrial questions by the Legislature. The socialization of plants through the instrumentality of councils is expressly refused. This plan was a long shot from the straight Soviet system advocated by the Independents, and even from the more moderate Labor Chamber plan—a compromise between Soviet and political democracy—sponsored by Kaliski. Naturally, the Independents were dissatisfied and continued their agitation.

The first Congress of German Soviets had appointed an Executive Council, consisting exclusively of Majority Socialists. This body, urged on by the Independents and the Left Wing of the Majority, at last issued a call for a Second Congress for April 8. On that day the session of the Congress opened in the meeting hall of the former Prussian House of Lords.

Considering that the rules and machinery of the election of delegates were controlled by the Executive Council, it is small wonder that the Majority Socialists found themselves in overwhelming majority at the Congress, being represented by 138 delegates as against fifty-five Independent Socialists, twenty-one adherents of the Soldiers' faction, twelve Democrats (bourgeois radicals), one representative each of the People's Party (National Liberals), National Party (Conservatives), the Centre, and the Communists, three delegates of the Peasants' Union (*Bauernbund*), nine Austrians, and one delegate without party connections. Throughout the proceedings the Independents, Soldiers' faction, and the Austrian delegates were aligned in a solid Left against the Majority Socialists, with whom were joined the representatives of the bourgeois parties.

The Congress elected the Majority Socialist Hauschild, of Cassel, chairman, and Richard Müller, the Berlin Independent leader, and Schröder, a soldiers' delegate from Munich, vice-chairmen. Secretaries representing all factions also were appointed.

The order of business embraced three principal items: reception of the report of the Executive Council; proposals on anchoring the council system; and proposals on socialization. In all, twenty-two resolutions were received by the secretariat; many of them of a rather irrelevant nature. The first four days were spent in a prolonged and extremely bitter trial of strength between the Majority Socialists and the Independents. Notwithstanding the overwhelming numbers of the former, the contest ended, in almost every phase, with a spectacular victory for the Independents. This was due to three factors: superior leadership, a clear-cut programme, and considerable strategic advantages; while dissensions, hesitancy and confused ideology prevailed throughout with the Majority.

The immediate occasion for the clash was furnished by a motion of the Independents to send telegrams of greeting to the Soviet Republics of Bavaria and Hungary. This seemingly innocent motion was, as events showed, a rather cleverly sprung device to split the Majority ranks. The leaders of the latter, including the Government members present, fell into the trap and lost their heads completely. After long altercations, the telegram to the Hungarian Government was voted, and that to Bavaria dropped. The first result was followed up by an Independent resolution demanding that the Government immediately set free Ledebour, the Independent leader arrested in the course of the March riots. The Majority was again hopelessly split, and the resolution carried. Exactly the same tactics were employed by the Independents in four or five other instances; the most important being that of a resolution calling on the Government to end the coal strike in the Ruhr district by granting the justified demands of the miners. In each case the Independents found it easy to terrorize a sufficiently large number of Majority Socialists into voting with them; and the Government members present, who throughout cut a rather sorry figure beside the astute leadership of Rosenfeld, Brasz, Müller, and Geyer, the Independent chieftains, fumed with impotent rage.

All this was, no doubt, excellent sport, but essentially nothing more; and the four first days passed without transacting real business. Even the report of the Executive Council, submitted by Leinert, was forgotten. The principal item on the programme was finally reached at the fifth meeting when the two reports on "anchoring" the council system were submitted by the official "referents," one, in behalf of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Majority Socialists, by Julius Kaliski and Max Cohen, chairman of the Executive Council; the other, in behalf of the Independent Socialists, by Ernest Däumig, one of the party's intellectual leaders.

The Cohen-Kaliski project is by far the most elaborate and ambitious scheme for making the Soviet idea an integral part of the German Constitution. It takes up the suggestions of organization laid down in the government proposal, but carries them further and develops them along both trade-industrial and political-geographical lines. It provides for "economic councils," embracing delegates of workers, office employees, and managers, to be organized in each plant. These councils are to supervise production. Economic councils* in the same branch of industry are linked together in district, province, and state economic councils, the whole edifice topped by a central economic council representing the particular industry of the entire country.

The resolution, in contrast to the Government scheme, declares, moreover, that "the economic council is the fundamental structure of socialization" in the particular industry. Thus by an ingenious, if rather obvious, stroke, the Cohen-Kaliski proposal undertakes to solve simultaneously the two outstanding problems of national economy, that of nationalization or socialization, and that of industrial representation.

Now for the political side. All economic councils of a given geographical unit—a municipality, for instance—elect representatives to a "chamber of labor" of the unit; the same is done in the district, province, state, and finally in the entire country. This central chamber of labor, elected by the councils of the whole nation, becomes a Second Chamber coördinated with the Parliament, or as the latter is called here, the People's Chamber. The former is representative of the producers, the latter of the consumers. The Chamber of Labor has legislative initiative in industrial and economic questions; above all, in matters of socialization. The People's Chamber has similar initiative in more strictly political and in cultural matters. A bill becomes law only if adopted by both chambers; but if one is adopted successively in three years by the People's Chamber, it becomes a statute over the veto of the Chamber of Labor. Both chambers have the right to call a referendum.

Finally, the Cohen-Kaliski proposal provides for "anchoring" the trade union system. It states that the unions are associations of workers in a particular calling to conduct collective bargaining with employers' associations. In any one plant the union is represented by the "works' council" (*Betriebsrat*). The entire machinery is extended to all lines of agriculture as well as to intellectual workers. It will be noted that the fundamental difference between this project and the plan sponsored by the Government is that while in the latter the Chamber of Labor is conceived as merely a consultative adjunct to Parliament, in the Cohen-Kaliski scheme the two bodies are put on an almost equal footing as organs of the National Legislative.

On the other hand, the Cohen-Kaliski proposal differs radically from the resolution submitted at the same meeting by the Independent Socialist Däumig, who characterized the former as a "miserable compromise," since it leaves the instrument of political democracy intact. At any rate, Däumig's measure has the virtue of extreme simplicity. It provides for workers' councils to take charge of political management, and works' councils, to handle economic-industrial affairs. The representatives of the workers' councils unite in a Congress of Soviets, which is the supreme political instance. It supplants the National Assembly, and has the right to appoint and remove the people's commissioners, who take the place of the Ministry. Only workers possess the right to vote and to participate in public affairs; the employing class is excluded, although intellectual workers are recognized on a fully equal footing with the proletariat. In a word, Däumig's system provides for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the establishment of a Soviet republic, but rather on the Hungarian than the Russian model. It differs from the latter by endowing the intellectual class with full rights—a difference carefully emphasized by Däumig and the other Independent speakers. In his speech Däumig accused the present German Government of betraying the revolution and the interest of the proletariat, and of being a mere tool in the hands of the exploiting class.

A third proposal, submitted by Dr. Paul Michaelis in behalf of the Democrats, assigns to the workers' councils purely economic functions, and puts an embargo on political activities. In the discussion, the Cohen-Kaliski plan was denounced by the Independents, mainly on the ground that it embraced the employing class. However, when a vote was taken, the Cohen-Kaliski scheme was adopted almost unanimously—five Democrats registering the only votes in opposition.

The seventh and last meeting of the Congress was taken up by the address of Karl Kautsky, one of the greatest of living Socialist scholars, on the subject of socialization. The address was read by Mrs. Kautsky in the absence of her husband, who was ill. It introduced a resolution declaring that socialization is a process indispensable for the welfare of the proletariat, the substitution of production by and for the commonwealth instead of capitalistic production for profit. However, he declared, headlong socialization has dangers no less than the continuation of capitalistic economy itself. Three factors must coöperate in a socialized state: the workers, the consumers, and the technical scientific experts. To disregard any of the three would be fatal. "Socialization does not mean simply the expropriation of capitalism and of the great landed proprietors, but also a reorganization of the entire economic life. . . . This cannot be achieved in a summary way for all branches of industry, or without preparations. It must proceed step by step, and it will take years to carry it out in full."

The account of the Second Congress of German Soviets would be incomplete without reference to its discussions on foreign policy. These discussions were kept alive by the industrious efforts of the two Majority Socialists, Max Cohen and Kaliski, who belong to the general staff of the Francophile propaganda directed by Georg Bernhard and the *Vossische Zeitung*. Cohen and Kaliski did not miss a single opportunity to deliver broadsides against the foreign policy of the Government, and more particularly against Erzberger, who is accused of "Anglomania" and is the chief scapegoat of the Francophiles. In the course of the Congress, Cohen and Kaliski made several speeches expounding their theory, which aims at a continental *bloc* of Germany, France, and Russia, directed against the Anglo-Saxon Powers. This is the old hobby of Georg Bernhard, who

* "Economic Council" is a rather inadequate translation of "*Wirtschaftsrat*," as the latter implies the idea of management.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

during the war was one of the most violent advocates of U-boat warfare as the best means to destroy British power; the plan appears now under a coat of Socialist paint, and the continental *bloc* is referred to in the *Sozialistische Monatshefte*, the organ of Cohen and Kaliski, as "the league of Socialist nations" against capitalist England and America. Another supporter of the scheme is Professor Otto Hoetzsch, one of the rabid Pan-German imperialists, in the conservative *Kreuzzeitung*. In their speeches before the Soviet Congress, Cohen and Kaliski urged that Germany's claims to Alsace-Lorraine should be expressly renounced, and the damage suffered by France in the war should be repaired by a voluntary effort of the German people, as the first step toward reconciliation. The Independent speakers endorsed this, but demanded that the efforts for *rapprochement* should be extended to the British proletariat as well. In the end a compromise resolution was adopted, condemning Erzberger and the foreign policy of the Government, and demanding reconciliation with France and Russia.

British Policy in Russia

By W. P. CROZIER

MR. LLOYD GEORGE said recently that though the Allies might settle with Germany and the other enemy Powers, there could be no real peace unless peace were made in Russia. This is not only political truth; it is, on even a superficial consideration of the facts, a truism. Though the Allies have ceased fighting their Germanic enemies, they are still making war in Russia. The British have just sent out reinforcements to Murmansk and Archangel; there is a combined Allied force in southern Russia; British ships are in the Caspian. From this point of view alone Mr. George cannot but desire peace in Russia, for the Russian campaign (though, like any other, it attracts as volunteers men who are full of the eternal spirit of adventure) is unpopular in England, especially with Labor. The Triple Alliance (railwaymen, miners, and transport workers) has just presented four demands to the Government under threat of a general strike if they are not fulfilled, and prominent among them is the abandonment of the Russian expeditions. To Labor the war in Russia means the prospect of the continuance of conscription and, as the recent bye-elections have shown, that is a thing which the masses of the people contemplate with sharp disfavor.

But apart from its effects on British domestic politics, the Russian war means endless turmoil in a large part of Europe. The Finns are fighting the Bolsheviks in Eastern Karelia, northeast of Petrograd. The Esthonians are advancing on Petrograd from the southwest. There are conflicts with the Poles over the eastern frontiers of the new Poland. There are conflicts with the Roumanians over Bessarabia. There is the likelihood that Roumania may at any time "go Bolshevik"; just as there is the certainty that the Bolsheviks will lend what aid they can to the Soviet Government of Hungary. More serious still, there is the probability, which is supported by the recent speeches of German political leaders, that Germany, overwhelmed by the terms of peace and made desperate by her exclusion from the League of Nations, may gravitate to an understanding with the Bolsheviks and the formation of an enormous *bloc* in Central and Eastern Europe, which will offset the rival *bloc* of the Allies and the United States.

Since such great issues depend on Russia, one might suppose that each of the Allies would have devised some logical, far-sighted policy to meet its needs. Of the three Powers most concerned it is much easier to diagnose the policy of France and the United States than that of England. The Government of republican France has been and is wholeheartedly anti-Bolshevik: let the heavens fall, it says, provided that the Bolsheviks fall too. The United States, we imagine, has been dragged by the associated Powers much further on the path of intervention than its President desired, and has since been trying to escape from the morass into which circumstances had seduced it.

The position and the policy of England are more difficult to follow, but in considering the tangled skein of evidence there is one important point which is seldom considered at all; and that is that in respect of Russia, England has an Asiatic as well as a European front. When the British Government is settling its Russian policy it has to consult not only the Foreign Office, the Admiralty and the War Office but the India Office too; and the voice of the India Office counts as much as any other. For half a century Russia was the bugbear of the Government of India. She was the enemy *par excellence* in Asia. From her was to come one of the "inevitable" wars, without the contemplation of which our jingoes are never easy in mind. For many years British policy aimed at setting up a series of buffer states—Afghanistan, Thibet, Beluchistan—between India and the advance of imperialistic Russia and, if the Anglo-Russian Convention of 1907 brought us into a working agreement with our old enemies, it did not prevent the two Governments from regarding each other jealously in Persia. With the revolution of 1917 imperialist Russia disappeared. But observe that while one anxiety disappeared for the time, two others took its place. The Bolsheviks are not a menace to India by force of arms, but they are by virtue of their theories. They have in fact already interested themselves in Indian affairs, publishing sundry reports relative to the British Administration. That is the first anxiety. The second is that if the Bolsheviks be overthrown, their immediate (though probably not their permanent) successors are likely to be just those imperialistic Russians whose hearts are set on reëstablishing the unity of Russia, with its old foreign policy and its old ambitions. M. Miliukov, the most ardent of them all, will have his turn. Whoever, therefore, sets out to analyze the recent trend of British policy in Russia should bear in mind that the India Office and the Indian Government have played a large part among the many counsellors who have been called in aid. Lord Curzon, the acting chief of the Foreign Office during the prolonged absence in Paris of Mr. Balfour and Lord Hardinge, is an ex-Viceroy of India and his views on Eastern policy are likely to be strictly in the tradition of the old diplomacy.

Perhaps it is to the multiplicity of counsellors that we must ascribe the uncertainty and confusion of British policy in Russia—Mr. Balfour representing the Balance of Power party at the Foreign Office, Lord Curzon the Indian bureaucracy that fears the revival of a strong Russia, Mr. George the leanings towards a Liberal statesmanship in Russia, which he has not the boldness to pursue. After the Bolshevik revolution, our first idea was, like that of the French, to support anyone who would fight against the Bolsheviks. So we backed the Ukrainians, who straightway made a treaty with the Germans and invited them into their

LIBRARY
WALTER REUTHER LABOR
WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY
DETROIT, OHIO
LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

country; and then we backed the Finns, who promptly called in German aid, chose a German Prince for the Finnish throne and were engaged in making ready to put him on it when the great collapse led them to discover how much they really loved the Allies. Then came the Czecho-Slovaks and Allied intervention, which was ostensibly directed to any other object than interference with Russia's domestic concerns. At all events, it failed to overthrow the Bolsheviks. The Japanese, who were to have marched to the Volga, refused to advance a step west of Lake Baikal. The Americans were of opinion that they had scarcely had a square deal from Japan in the Siberian venture, and eventually they refused to extend their share in intervention. The British in the Archangel and Murmansk regions, had small forces, dangerously extended, whose efforts had no substantial effect on the Bolshevik position.

These failures led to a second phase in British policy. Mr. George proposed that the Russian factions, the Bolsheviks included, should be invited to Paris. When this project had been decisively rejected by France, Mr. Wilson, supported by Mr. George, evolved the Prinkipo proposal, which also fell to the ground. Both these projects implied a totally different policy from military intervention. They aimed at securing peace in Russia by negotiation with the Bolsheviks, and were, to that limited extent, a recognition of the Soviet Government. But these tentative efforts having failed (partly from French opposition and partly from the curt refusal of the Russian *émigrés* to coöperate) England slipped back toward the military solution. True, there were to be no more expeditions: America would send neither men, supplies, nor money; France announced that she was withdrawing her troops from northern Russia; the British bye-elections and British Labor congresses forced Mr. George and his Ministry to say repeatedly that there was no question of extended expeditions; but at the same time everything was to be done to furnish all kinds of material support to Kolchak, Denikin, Dutov, and the other imperialist Russians, in the hope that they would eventually wear down and overthrow the Bolsheviks. The Bolsheviks were to be crushed by the same means as Germany had been. They were subjected to a most stringent blockade by the Allies, from the north, from the east, and on the Black Sea side; while the sea-borne resources of the Allies were in some measure placed at the disposal of their enemies.

At the same moment that this policy was reaffirmed, it was discovered that the Big Four were again attempting to produce peace by coming to an arrangement with all the Russian parties through the agency of Dr. Nansen. Russia was to be fed, on condition that fighting ceased within its borders, and as a consequence, the Allies would no longer send war material to the anti-Bolsheviks. The divisions of the Allies can be seen at the bottom of this strange dual policy. In it are to be read the inclinations of Mr. Wilson and Mr. George; in the Kolchak policy, the hopes and aims of M. Pichon and the French Foreign Office.

But we in England, who see our Government responsible for both methods, must pursue our analysis a little further, and when we do so the confusion becomes worse confounded. Suppose, for instance, that the Russian reactionaries, with our assistance, should finally defeat the Bolsheviks. Their slogan is the "unity of Russia." M. Miliukov, who may be taken as the lowest common denominator of their foreign policy, is an imperialist to the backbone, and was the leader of the Cadets, whose first breach with the Socialists in 1917 arose over the decision of the latter to grant autonomy to the Ukraine. But at the present moment we are supporting the Finns in their movement into Eastern Karelia and the Poles in their demands for an extended Eastern frontier against Great Russia. Nothing is more certain than that our Russian imperialist friends, should they climb to power, will come into conflict of the most acute kind with Poles and Finns; only the other day Prince Lvov, the head of the first Russian Republican Ministry, caused sharp emotion in Poland by a statement hinting broadly that complete independence for Finland was a thing that must by no means be taken for granted.

So much for one aspect of the dilemma. There is another which, from the purely British point of view, is more serious. The triumph of Kolchak and the *émigrés* means the revival of imperialist Russia along the whole Asiatic front. It is impossible that the Government of India or the Indian Office can desire that. In Europe, the British Government, like its Allies, is afraid of the spread of Bolshevism from East to West. Russia is the centre of infection which it would fain sterilize. But, to judge from the policy which it pursues, it will only remove one enemy in Europe to set up another in Asia. It is perhaps to this cause that we must ascribe the policy which the British Foreign Office (inspired from India) is still pursuing in Persia. It has frowned on all the demands of Persia at the Peace Conference and is disposed not so much to strengthen an independent Persia as to maintain that hold upon her which was established before the war. If we seek for motives, the explanation probably is that the Indian Government does not believe the present state of things in Russia to be permanent. It anticipates that imperialist Russia will shortly arise again; and that, shattered in Europe, and overshadowed by Japan in the Far East, she may turn southward in the Middle East for the satisfaction of her aims. From the point of view of cold self-interest, one must admit that it is a not unreasonable line of calculation. It does not consider the problem, of course, from the standpoint of Russia's interests—that has been little heard of in this article!—and it takes too gloomy a view of the permanence of Russia's impulse toward liberty. The *émigrés* may find it much easier to get to Moscow than to hold Russia down in permanence.

The only sound solution of the problem is that England, for her part, should allow the Russian people to work out their own destiny undisturbed by military intervention, direct or indirect, and should accept them sincerely into the new Society of Nations. If she intends to pursue a Balance of Power policy in Europe and wants a strong Russia to set over against a revived Germany, then she must be prepared to face a strong Russia in Asia too. But it is not likely to be a Russia grateful to England. Many of these Russian reactionaries were ready enough to make a deal with Germany in the spring and summer of 1918 when they thought that Germany was the winning horse. They will own no gratitude to an England which from time to time is putting out feelers toward the Bolsheviks and restricts to mere war-material the help which it gives the anti-Bolsheviks. They will say, perhaps, with a cynical smile, that it was to England's interest to keep Russia weak, divided and disintegrated; and that her dual policy, looking now toward peace and now toward war, and never one way or the other consistently for long, had just that effect on the fortunes of their country.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Documents

Decrees of the Hungarian Soviet Government

THE following decrees and summaries are translated from the Hungarian newspapers, *Pesti Hirlap* and *Pesti Naplo.*

Decree on the Communization of Housing

(Published in *Pesti Hirlap* for March 27)

1. All houses used for residential purposes, with the appertaining grounds and fixtures, are the property of the Soviet Republic of Hungary.

2. Rents are to be collected by the janitor in conjunction with a trustee elected by the tenants, and must be deposited with banks to be designated by the People's Commissioner of Finances.

3. Those who so far have not paid any rent because they owned the houses in which they resided, as well as those who occupied apartments rent free, but not as a partial compensation from the State for services rendered, will henceforth have to pay rents. These will be fixed by the District Housing Committees, to be appointed by the People's Commissioner for Social Production.

4. The District Housing Committees will supervise the collection of rents. They will be authorized to proceed against tenants in case of delinquency. Penalties must be adapted to the requirements of individual cases. In justifiable instances the committees have the right to transfer tenants to emergency quarters, or to cancel their food tickets.

5. The District Housing Committees shall undertake all necessary repairs in houses and apartments.

6. [This paragraph names the thirty-three largest cities of Hungary where the provisions are to have effect immediately. The Commissioner for Social Production is authorized to extend the decree to other cities and towns as the need arises.]

7. Clauses 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of this decree do not apply to such residences as were erected or purchased by a workingman or office employe and are used by him as a dwelling place. No rents will be collected for such residences, but a tax will be assessed on the ground value.

8. In houses where there is no janitor rents will be collected and repairs supervised by trustees elected by the tenants.

9. Any rent collector who fails to deposit rents within three days from date of collection at the bank designated is subject to a penalty of imprisonment not exceeding five years. The same penalty applies to any person who wilfully appropriates fixtures appertaining to a house or who wilfully damages a building or its fixtures. Acts of this kind will be passed upon by the revolutionary tribunals.

10. This decree will be executed by the Department of the People's Commissioner for Social Production.

Budapest, March 26

(Signed) Revolutionary Governing Council.

Decree on the Free Exercise of Religion

(Published in *Pesti Naplo* for April 11.)

The Soviet Republic regards religion as the private affair of the individual, and safeguards everybody's right to exercise his religion freely.

Any person who hampers or interferes with any other person in the free exercise of his religion is regarded by the Soviet Republic as the enemy of revolutionary order.

However, a certain section of the clergy use the right to the free exercise of religion as a pretext for fostering, openly or secretly, counter-revolutionary agitation, and at religious meetings incite against the order, spirit and institutions of the Soviet Republic. In most places the meetings during Easter Week are utilized for this purpose. The Revolutionary Governing Council will prosecute such abuses with the utmost rigor. At the same time it orders all local Workers', Soldiers' and Peasants' Councils, and all Soviet officials and delegates under their jurisdiction, to safeguard, to the utmost of their ability, the freedom of all meetings of genuinely religious character, the so-called Resurrection processions on Easter Eve included.

In the future the Soviet Republic will refrain from interfering with the exercise of religion even in this limited sense. Whereas, however, at present counter-revolutionists try in many places to incite the masses, not yet duly enlightened, against the rule of workmen, soldiers and peasants, with the allegation that the dictatorship of the proletariat is the enemy of the freedom of conscience; whereas, furthermore, these deceivers of the people disseminate the charge that the Soviet Republic prepares to abolish religion and to divert the churches and chapels from their religious uses; whereas, finally, there are even such persons as are not ashamed to allege that the Soviet Republic desires to "communize" women; now, therefore, I order as follows:

The Workmen's, Soldiers' and Peasants' Councils shall provide that on Easter Sunday and the two subsequent Sundays the clergymen shall make the following announcement from the pulpit, and explain it to their congregations:

1. The Soviet Republic safeguards everybody's right to exercise his religion freely.

2. No person will be suffered to interfere with clergymen in their religious activities or in the execution of religious rites.

3. Churches and other buildings used for religious purposes, such as chapels and other places of worship, will also in the future be used for religious purposes exclusively, and nobody plans to transform churches into theatres or cabarets or meeting-halls or community-centers.

4. The Communist Soviet Republic, also called the Dictatorship of the Proletariat, will not alter the form of marriage and family life as practiced hitherto, and has no intention to do so. It will not communize women, and has no intention to do so.

5. All those who, by asserting the contrary, try to mislead the people, will be considered as enemies of the revolutionary order, and treated as such.

Budapest, April 17, 1919 SIGISMUND KUNFI
People's Commissioner of Public Education

[An appendix to this decree orders Jewish ministers to make the above announcements on two subsequent Saturdays.]

Regulations of Wholesale and Retail Trade

(Published in *Pesti Naplo* for April 18.)

Decree issued by the People's Commissioner of Supplies on April 10.

1. All wholesale and retail stores where, in accordance with Decree XXXI of the Revolutionary Governing Council, Workers' Committees of Control have been duly elected, must be reopened, provided the People's Commissioner for Social Production has been notified of such election.

Wholesale and retail stores employing fewer than three workers elect no such committees; such stores, if located in the area of Greater Budapest, shall, within three days, apply to the National Federation of Commercial Employes for the appointment of a delegate each. Such stores may be reopened after the Commissioner of Social Production has been notified of the appointment of the delegates.

No stores can be reopened unless full inventories have been submitted.

All stores engaged exclusively in selling alcoholic beverages must remain closed. Until further notice no stores may be reopened to engage in selling the following articles: military supplies, oriental rugs, genuine gobelins, furs valued in excess of 1,000 crowns apiece, art furniture in excess of 6,000 crowns, a bedroom suite, 10,000 crowns, a dining or living-room suite, or single pieces in excess of 3,000 crowns; art objects and antiques; postage stamp collections and curiosities.

LIBRARY
BALDWIN-WALLACE COLLEGE
BEREA, OHIO

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

[Clauses 2-6 contain a list of purchase-centrals for wholesale stores.]

7. Maximum prices remain fixed as heretofore.

Articles for which no maximum prices are promulgated must be sold at prices including cost-plus-overhead expense. Any advance (profit) over and above such price is prohibited.

8. All receipts and expenditures as well as stocks must be entered on the books.

9. All stores must keep an account with any one of the socialized banks or the postal savings bank. No store may have more than one account.

No cash may be kept on hand in excess of 2,000 crowns. Receipts in excess of this sum must be deposited on the store account on the next day if over 10,000 crowns, otherwise at least once a week.

All payments exceeding 500 crowns must be made by draft.

10. Pending the appointment of store commissaries by the Commissioner of Supplies, in stores employing more than three workers the workers' committee of control elects a trustee. This trustee manages the business in conjunction with the former proprietor (manager). The trustee and the former proprietor (manager) handle all receipts and such expenditures as are necessary to the continuation of business. At the closing of business, stores must be locked up with two keys, one to be retained by the elected trustee, the other by the former proprietor (manager). The premises must be locked up and opened by these two persons or their representatives.

The names of the elected trustee and the former proprietor must be immediately registered with the section of business records, Department of Commissioner of Supplies.

In enterprises employing fewer than three workers the management will be in charge of the delegate appointed by the Federation of Commercial Employes, in conjunction with the former proprietor (manager).

11. The Workers' Committee of Control supervises the conduct of business, guards the socialized business property (stock, cash, fixtures) and is, in conjunction with the elected trustee and the former proprietor (manager), responsible for the observation of all regulations and decrees.

The Workers' Committee of Control, or where no such committee exists, the delegate of the Federation of Commercial Employes, in conjunction with the store employes, will make suggestions as to the salary to be paid to the former proprietor (manager), provided he is actively participating in the management, in proportion to the services rendered by him.

Suggestions as to such salaries must be submitted, for Greater Budapest, at the Section of Business Records, Department of Commissioner of Supplies; and in other cities, to the local representative of the department. Such salaries can be paid only against vouchers issued by the Department.

12. Exemptions from the rules and regulations of this decree can be granted by the Department of Commissioner of Supplies in extraordinary cases only.

13. The rules and regulations of this decree do not apply to stores which up to date were not obliged to prepare and submit inventories. (Food-stores, pharmacies, drug-stores, book and stationery stores, florists and tobacconists.)

14. Transgressions of this decree will be prosecuted by the Revolutionary Tribunal.

Budapest, April 10, 1919

Department of Commissioner of Supplies.

Regulations Relating to Agricultural Coöperative Associations

(Summary Published in *Pesti Hirlap* for April 15)

Agricultural Coöperative Associations may be formed on any territorial unit by the number of persons required for intensive cultivation. Any person may join who guarantees a minimum of 120 working days a year for the cultivation of the association lands. All members share in the products in proportion to their actual labor. The formation of associations for as large units as possible is encouraged, as this insures better and more profitable cultivation. Each association is headed by a committee of five to ten trustees, elected by the membership. The committee includes the expert steward or manager, who, however, is not a member of the association. Several associations are joined under a circle-inspector; several circles form a district, and the whole organization is supervised by the National Central of Productive Associations, which, again, is under the jurisdiction of the People's Commissioner for Agriculture. This organization of the agricultural production has for its aim: (1) the exploitation of the advantages of large scale cultivation; (2) the facilitation of provisioning city populations. Between March 21 (the proclamation of the Soviet Republic) and April 15, such coöperative associations have been formed on 2,500,000 acres, all representing large estates taken over into state ownership.

Abolition of Religious Instruction

According to the *Pesti Hirlap*, the Revolutionary Council at Alba Regia (Stuhlweissenburg) has issued a decree abolishing religious instruction in all schools in Fehér county. The decree orders that the morality and self-respect of the children shall be developed by instruction in ethics. Another decree of the Council takes over all denominational schools into the control of the Soviet Republic. The decree also provides that the teaching of history shall be changed so as to correspond to proletarian ideals. Every praise of the old order of society must be stricken out. The preaching of chauvinism must cease. Instead of patriotism the teacher must inculcate the love of humanity, the equality of nations, the common interests of mankind. The teachers must expound the history of the Serfs' Rebellion in 1514, the socialist phase of the Revolution in 1848, the Revolution of October 31, 1918, and that of March 21, 1919. The decree orders teachers to familiarize themselves with the doctrines of socialism, and gives notice that members of the revolutionary government will personally ascertain whether the new principles are adhered to.

Miscellaneous Decrees

(Summaries Published in *Az Est* for April 18)

Decree on taking over charitable institutions: The Soviet Republic takes over the management of all institutions, foundations, public funds or other establishments which serve the purposes of mothers' and children's protection, poor relief or war relief. All property formerly owned by such establishments is declared public property.

Decree on revision of criminal procedure: All trials for criminal offenses instituted under the old régime will be revised, as many of these trials were based on a conception of right and law diametrically opposed to that of the Soviet Government. Persons indicted under the old régime for offenses against the capitalistic order will be acquitted.

Decree prohibiting medical advertising: The Department of the People's Commissioner for Labor and Social Welfare prohibits the publication of advertisements relating to medical services, both in the newspapers or by other methods. The decree says that the newspapers still carry paid insertions by which physicians try to attract public attention. Such practices are at variance with the spirit and ethics of the medical profession, constitute unfair competition, are apt to mislead the general public, and are therefore prohibited.

The Reopening of Schools

[The Budapest schools remained closed in the days following the proclamation of proletarian dictatorship on March 21. They were reopened on April 10. A summary of the reopening decree issued by the Metropolitan Commissioner of Education was published in *Pesti Naplo* for April 11.]

The abolition of divisions separating hand workers from head workers has made clear that the schools are plants where pupils and teachers work together for the weal of the proletariat. Therefore, in the future schools will be closed only on legal labor holidays (including Sundays).

All paintings, designs and sculpture representing kings or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

high officials, as well as those of a religious nature, must be removed from class rooms. Only pictures of the real benefactors of humanity, of those men and women who have advanced the cause of the proletariat, may be displayed.

Prayers at the start and close of the school day are abolished.

The pupils shall practice singing the *Marseillaise* and the *Internationale*, these airs to be sung at all school festivals.

The pupils' literary circles must propagate the knowledge of revolutionary literature. They shall be named after prominent revolutionists.

The Jews in Poland

THE following material relating to the treatment of the Jews in Poland forms part of the material submitted by the Committee for the Defense of the Jews in Poland to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House of Representatives.

1. Letter of H. N. Brailsford to "The Times" (London):

Sir.—Your Parliamentary report contains some questions and answers regarding the shooting of thirty-four Jews by Polish troops at Pinsk on April 5. The Foreign Office confirms the fact, but cannot say whether this killing was a "massacre." I was at Pinsk two weeks before this date, and should like to give my evidence. The Poles had taken Pinsk from the Bolshevists about a fortnight before my visit, were holding it with inadequate and only half-equipped forces, and were in a state of very natural nervousness. The general in command told me that he might have to evacuate it at any moment. "What," he said, "are you to do, with a Jewish spy in every house?" This belief that all Jews are Bolshevists was held by every Polish officer. It is true that some of the Jewish Socialist youth had actively helped the Bolshevists. It is also true that all Jews dreaded the Polish occupation, and with good reason. But the average orthodox, long-robed Jews of the Pale, nine in ten at least of the Jewish population, regarded any revolutionary doctrine with horror. The Poles acted on their suspicions and prejudices. The Jewish houses in Pinsk were thoroughly pillaged by the troops on their entry. The practice prevailed of forcing Jews to do menial duties for the troops, without pay. All Hebrew inscriptions were removed, even from the schools and hospitals. Though the population of Pinsk was Jewish to the extent of seventy per cent., only two Jews were allowed to sit in the nominated Town Council of twelve members. Conditions in Brest-Litovsk were scarcely better.

I feared that further excesses were contemplated both against the Jews of the town and the Ukranians or White Russians of the villages. The Commandant of Pinsk said in my presence: "We know very well that the population is hostile to us. We propose to make an example. We shall burn down some villages and shoot one in ten of the population." This threat impressed me so much that on my return to Warsaw I saw General Pilsudski and reported to him what I had seen and heard. I also wrote a memorandum for the British Mission. The moral is, I am afraid, that, even when timely warning is given, General Pilsudski, a humane and liberal man, is not strong enough to prevent the oppression and even slaughter of the Jews. I am reporting only the barest facts. The overwhelming impression left on me after talks with Polish officials and officers on the one hand, and the Jewish leaders on the other, was that Polish intolerance is incurable. . . . One must have seen, as I did, the open distribution of anti-Jewish leaflets during the recent elections in Warsaw, by the dominant party of MM. Dmowski and Paderewski, to realize how far anti-Semitism is the official policy.

When I visited Pinsk the place was literally starving. Nearly all the shops were closed, for there was no food to sell. Even the Jewish orphanage and almshouse were without bread. I saw emaciated bodies which had fallen dead that day in the street. Since that date I do not doubt that the arrival of American flour has brought an improvement. I wish to add, however, my belief that unless the distribution is controlled by very critical Western officials, who will insist (no easy matter) on talking directly to the Jews, the relief will not reach all of those who need it. I wish as a non-Jew to give my evidence in this matter, since the word of Jews seems to be suspect, but there is equal cause for uneasiness about the Orthodox non-Polish rural population, which also was starving and suspect.

Yours, &c.,

Welwyn, May 21 H. N. BRAILSFORD

2. Statement of the Under-Secretary of State in the English House of Commons.

Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, English Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on June 5 made the following statement in the House of Commons, in answer to a question by Lord Henry Cavendish-Bentinck.*

I fear there is no doubt that anti-Semitic disturbances have recently occurred in Poland and in the territories under Polish occupation, and that Polish troops have taken part in them. No official reports have so far been received concerning the alleged incidents at the places mentioned in the second part of the question, but a report has been received that a disturbance has occurred at Czenstochau, in which some soldiers from General Haller's Army joined the mob in attacking Jews. There were forty-five Jewish casualties, including five deaths, and one officer and ten gendarmes were injured in attempting to keep order. As regards the last part of the Noble Lord's question, apart from the representations which they have addressed to the Polish Government, His Majesty's Government can only act in concert with the Allied and Associated Governments.

3. Confiscatory Proclamations.

PROCLAMATION OF THE COMMANDANT AT STRZYZOW, ARTICLE V

Citizens, sad experience forces us to appeal for your help in preserving precious supplies from destruction. I therefore proclaim, until final confirmation by the Polish Commission of Liquidation, the following order: I requisition all merchandise for the benefit of the national treasury, with the exception of food necessary for the daily life of the local population. The latter is to be sold exclusively in the store of the local Kolkorolnize [coöperative].

I order the mayor and the commandant of militia to confiscate today all goods in stock belonging to Jews, and to make inventories, if possible. The stores are to be closed and all sales prohibited, and Jewish stores so closed are to bear this sign: "Confiscated in favor of the Polish Treasury." The goods will be put on sale at a designated time, at maximum prices, at designated stores.

Just as I have shown myself loyal and calm in my orders, I shall protect the public from any disturbance of public order and from the destruction of public goods.

I declare that if such attempts are made, I shall be capable of proceeding with the utmost severity, and I have given corresponding orders on this subject to the competent security agencies.

I make the officers of the municipality and the local militia responsible for the most exact execution of this order.

Strzyzow, November 6, 1918

PROCLAMATION TO THE PEOPLE OF JEWISH FAITH IN PRZEMYSL

In view of the established fact that Jews have taken a considerable part in the struggle for the conquest of Przemysl

*On June 8, the American Minister at Warsaw reported that he knew of no pogroms in Poland.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and that they have fired on Polish troops, in spite of their promise of neutrality, I demand that the Jewish community hand over to the commandant of Polish troops of the district of Przemysl the sum of three million crowns as security.

The security mentioned will be forfeited in case of serious excesses on the part of the Jewish people against the Polish troops, and will revert to the treasury of the latter.

The security must be delivered not later than 2 P. M. on the 21st of this month.

In case the security is not delivered at the appointed time, I shall order my military detachments to take this sum from the Jewish population by force.

Przemysl, November 17, 1918

TOKARZEWSKI, M.P., Lieutenant and Commandant of the district

TO THE JEWISH COMMUNITY OF USTRZYKI DOLNO!

It has been established that the Jewish population has sided with the Ukrainians against the Polish troops engaged in bringing peace and order into the land. Due to these inimical and criminal activities, three of our soldiers have suffered death. The perpetrators will have to pay for their deeds. The Jewish community, which has not known how to prevent this, is now ordered, as punishment, to hand over three hundred thousand crowns to be paid in the course of one hour. In case of non-payment, the Jewish houses will be bombarded and fired with dynamite, whereupon the fine will be collected by force.

The officer who delivers this communication is authorized to receive the sum and to give a receipt for same.

SVOBODA, Lieutenant, Commanding the Expedition

The Case Against the Treaty

THE following manifesto on the Peace Treaty, recently made public by the Union of Democratic Control of Great Britain, was signed for the executive committee of the Union by Charles Roden Buxton, J. A. Hobson, F. W. Pethick-Lawrence, J. Ramsay Macdonald, E. D. Morel, R. C. Lambert, H. B. Lees Smith, Arthur Ponsonby, Mrs. Ethel Snowdon, H. M. Swanwick, and Charles Trevelyan.

We desire on behalf of this Union, which since its foundation in November, 1914, has pressed for such a political settlement of the war as would lay the foundations of an enduring peace, to register an immediate protest against the proposed Treaty of Peace with Germany. In our opinion it violates the terms and principles on the faith of which the German nation laid down its arms. As such it constitutes an indefensible breach of that international morality whose vindication it was the declared aim of the Allied and Associated Governments to ensure.

On October 20, 1918, the new German Government under Prince Max of Baden, having carried out far-reaching constitutional reforms, notified President Wilson of its willingness to make peace on the basis of the terms specified in the President's speech to Congress in the preceding January (the "Fourteen Points" declaration) and of the principles outlined therein and in subsequent addresses. On November 5, the Allied Governments notified the Government of the United States that they accepted those terms and principles with two reservations. They drew up the conditions of the armistice, which were accepted by Germany. These were of such a nature as to leave the German people with no defence other than reliance upon the plighted word of the Allied and Associated Governments. Thus on both sides it was agreed that the Fourteen Points were the fundamental basis of the Peace.

It had long been contended by the Allied and Associated Governments that their quarrel was not with the people but with the rulers of Germany. These rulers have now been overthrown by the German revolution. The Emperor has abdicated and the reigning dynasties have fallen. The Allied and Associated Govments are now dealing with the German people.

The Peace Terms presented to Germany are, therefore, presented to the new German Republic, beset with internal and external difficulties of the gravest kind. Refusal to sign would be followed by a further prolongation of the blockade, a process of starvation—against which our soldiers have protested and which has filled the neutral world with horror.

The territorial arrangements arrived at without ascertaining the wishes of the peoples affected, particularly as regards the eastern portions of the German state, the Saar Valley, and Alsace-Lorraine, are marked by the same lack of vision and disregard for human rights which the German Government displayed in 1871, and at Brest Litovsk. The severance of East Prussia from the rest of Germany is a recurrence to the traditions of a disastrous past which it was hoped had been definitely repudiated. A Polish state thus constituted, and including large districts of a purely German population, cannot but prove a centre of bitter racial conflict in Europe.

The conditions under which the German population of the Saar Valley is to be detached from Germany against its will; the military occupation for a period of fifteen years of German territory on the left bank of the Rhine, an occupation which may be indefinitely prolonged in the event of Germany being unable to fulfill the whole of the obligations imposed upon her; the seizure of all the German colonies—these measures constitute not a peace of justice but a peace of violence.

But these particular examples merely typify the general purpose underlying every section of the Treaty.

That purpose is obvious. It is to reduce the new democratic Germany to the position of a vassal state, to render her commercial recovery impossible; to drive her out of international life; to crush the spirit of her people. Their exclusion from the League of Nations; their disarmament alone among the Powers of Europe; the imposition upon them of enormous and indefinite financial burdens, combined with numberless handicaps to their commercial and industrial rehabilitation, display this purpose in the clearest light. They are robbed of the greater part of their ocean and river craft, and of many of their commercial cables. They may not discriminate against Allied trade, but the Allies can discriminate against theirs. They are forced to dispose of enormous stocks of coal annually to the Allies after being dispossessed of a large proportion of their own coalfields, to consent to an embargo upon their dyestuffs and chemical products, and to build one million tons of shipping for the Allies in five years. Their property in Africa and Asia is confiscated and their enterprise barred from those continents. The prospect for the German people under the Treaty is that of a people of serfs working for their conquerors in arms.

Not thus can a better world arise from the ashes of the past. Not thus can atonement be made to the peoples for the long agony of the war. A victory which was to have made the world safe for democracy is consummated in a peace which is a betrayal of democracy.

It may be that the people of Germany, broken by the protraction of a scientific method of enforced starvation under the blockade, have no option but to sign a Treaty whose rejection would condemn them to see their children perish before their eyes.

But we are convinced that it will rouse every true democrat to labor ceaselessly for its revision. The Treaty shows that the perpetuation of national hatreds and the pursuit of imperialist annexations and short-sighted vengeance are still the aims of an officialdom which no experience can enlighten.

For our part we do not recognize it as having any moral validity and regard as our chief task the substitution for it of a peace which will correspond with President Wilson's Fourteen Points and with the aspirations and ideals of the common people everywhere.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Foreign Press

The Demands of the Czech Socialists

THE *Pravo Lidu* (Prague) of April 16 prints the following local item:

Yesterday evening a big mass meeting was held in the large hall of the Simchov Brewery, where the question of the speedy return of our soldiers from Siberia was discussed; and also the internal conditions of our Republic.

The first speaker was Serg. Fr. Janik, an officer of the Siberian Army, who discussed the situation of the Czecho-Slovak Army in Siberia. In the beginning of his address, he spoke of the situation of the Czech nation at the beginning of the war, picturing the sacrifice and spirit of the Bohemian soldiers in their fight for national independence, explaining the situation in which the army finds itself today, and emphasizing the necessity of their return to their homes. . . .

The second speaker, who discussed the political situation, was Com. A. Nemec, President of the Central Executive Committee of the Socialist party, and member of the National Assembly. He said:

The war lasted almost five years and the people cannot get real peace; we are all suffering under unusual conditions, and we cannot tell when they will end. The war ended in October, but only in name; we see Prague flooded with soldiers; we hear about new battles, and there are those who would drive you into new war. When we look at conditions as they have developed in the last few years, we see that we are well vindicated. The development of events shows that we were right in proclaiming at the beginning that the war was only in behalf of capitalistic interests and motives, and that there was no real question of principles and ideas involved, . . . but that it was simply a quarrel between two capitalistic cliques. . . . Germany had reached such a point in her economic development that it was necessary for her to get new markets in order to avoid industrial disturbances at home. Germany did not want to make concessions, and her leaders thought that war would be a good medicine for the unruly elements which were in the way of advancing capitalism and imperialism; and that if victorious they might be able to get Socialism out of the way for many years. . . .

Not even America entered the war without selfish interests. Her intention was to rid herself of English competition, and that she accomplished. The American dollar is ruling the world-markets today. America wants to make peace with Russia, not for democratic reasons, but to gain markets for manufactured goods and raw materials. And one fact is clear, that the American army is not going to fight in Russia, nor will the English or French. And as the Allies are always telling us what they have done for us, I believe it is time that we should tell them what we have done for them. Our boys under French command, and especially on the Russian front, have paid with their blood for what we have today. For that reason when the Allies give us something—and by the way, they are not giving from their own, but are giving other people's property, and only the things which they consider to their own political advantage to give—for that reason, I say, if anybody ought to be thankful it should be the Allies to the Czecho-Slovak army, and to the Czecho-Slovak Nation.

There are very few people in Bohemia who wish either for intervention or for new war. The National Assembly, the majority of our Government, and the President, are against war. But the Prime Minister, Dr. Kramar, wants intervention. In Paris he is conferring about intervention, against the will of the people, our Government and the President. He wants to barter our blood to prove that the capitalistic interests are the first to be protected by the nation (Voice from audience, "He owns large estates in Russia"). When the Prime Minister returns from Paris, the National Assembly will have something to say to him.

The speaker took up broadly the activities of our bourgeosie and called for a strong campaign in the coming elections. . . .

The chairman of the meeting read the following resolution:

Be it resolved that we, in meeting assembled, on the 15th of April, after hearing speeches and reports, demand that our Czecho-Slovak army at present in Siberia be given every opportunity to return to their homes at the earliest possible date. After five years of hardship, fighting, and separation from their families, the Czech soldiers have earned the right to return to their homes. We demand from our Socialist members of the National Assembly that they bring this matter to a speedy and successful conclusion. We expect from our Government that they will use every political and diplomatic means to fulfil this just demand.

In regard to conditions in our Republic, and domestic and foreign politics, we announce: That we are strongly against any imperialistic war, and against any intervention in Hungary or in Russia, such as is advocated in Paris personally by Dr. Kramar against the will of the National Assembly and the Government.

We demand from our Government, in regard to domestic policy, drastic measures against profiteering and usury, which we consider most detrimental to our Republic, and the execution of necessary social reforms.

We do not consider the development of the Czech Republic as final because the ideal of the Czech working class is a Socialist Republic, for which we will work with all our means and might.

This resolution was accepted by the assembly and the meeting was adjourned.

The French in Tunis

A STRONG indictment of French colonial policy in Tunis and a plea for Tunisian independence are made by Eugene Frot in the following article from *Le Populaire*, of Paris.

Tunis has a long history of brilliant civilization. It cannot be reckoned one of those semi-barbarous countries to which European civilization can think itself necessary. In fact, before French intervention, Tunis already knew those political liberties which are the usual prelude of the most complete popular emancipation. In 1861, while we still endured the yoke of the Second Empire, the Tunisian state enjoyed a constitution which, if not liberal, was at least adequate to restrain the authority of the Bey.

Some twenty years later, France undertook the task of reducing to nothing this embryo of popular emancipation. Ferry, whose name is also associated with Tonkin, sent troops into Tunisia, taking as a pretext sume incursions of nomad bands into Algeria, for which the Tunisian Government could not be held responsible. The treaty of Bardo was imposed on the Bey almost without difficulty; and the French protectorate over the country was established. The Resident General, who was to represent our Government with the Bey, in reality obtained all power. To make his work easier the French Government abolished the Tunisian constitution. Republican France, under the leadership of colonial imperialists, restored absolute power in Tunis. A Council of Ministers was created, composed of Frenchmen, whose irresponsibility under both French and Tunisian law is complete.

Little by little the land, owned collectively, according to Mohammedan custom, by the natives, passed into the hands of the Government, which distributed it at ridiculous prices to French colonists. The less numerous small Tunisian proprietors were no less harshly treated. Little by little, wiped out

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by debts, ruined by the competition of the great development syndicates, they had to sell their scanty individual possessions to swell the number of expropriated proletarians.

But statistics are the most eloquent arguments. There were in Tunisia three million hectares of good arable land. Fewer than 2,500 colonists own a third of them. A small group of large proprietors—about two hundred—succeeded in seizing more than ten thousand hectares.

It is significant that our deputies or senators have known how to profit by the opportunities which their political position gives them to advance their personal interests. Among the despoilers of the natives the following are best known by reason of their wealth and their political position in France: M. Paul Deschanel, president of the Chamber of Deputies, owns more than 10,000 hectares over there. MM. Boucher, Mougeot, Cochery, Chaumié, Krautz, Pedebidou, Chautemps, all former framers of the Tunisian budget, own estates ranging from 3,000 to 30,000 hectares. All these acquisitions were made at incredible prices, from one franc to ten francs per hectare. Today each hectare is worth 400 to 500 times as much. To facilitate the despoiling of the natives the Government has created so-called legal weapons. Entire tribes have been expropriated of their very extensive communal lands. And it is the Tunisian budget, maintained by the natives whom it dispossessed, that pays the expenses of these expropriations.

By this system the greater part of the Tunisian people have been thrust into the ranks of the proletariat. Exploitation by the colonists has similarly been made easy. The great abundance of manual labor has reduced wages to a ridiculous level, which the organized system of fines makes still lower. In the countries subject to the French protectorate some social laws, which exist in France, are not applied. So it is that the truck-system prevails over there in all its harshness. It is applied everywhere by the public works contractors. Instead of paying wages in cash, they pay in tokens, which may be exchanged for merchandise at the company-store. It is impossible for the Tunisian laborer, agricultural or urban, to rise out of his condition of actual serfdom.

However, some of the former proprietors of the soil prefer to flee before the invader, rather than to yield completely to French exploitation. They make their way to the Tunisian south, go into the desert regions, and thus escaping oppression, are reduced to living in unproductive and difficult surroundings.

It would be dangerous for their oppressors if the Tunisian people became more aware of their power and their rights. To ward off this danger the French capitalist Government is careful not to spread popular education in the country. It has done nothing for the intellectual emancipation of its protégés. Rather it has punished without pity those who have wished to bring the enlightenment of modern education to their co-religionists. The great majority of Tunisian children learn nothing outside the Koran school, where the pupil learns to read and write Arabic religious texts and nothing else. A primary education, partly French, partly Arabic, is given to a fraction of little Tunisians —about twelve out of a thousand—who receive no benefit, because of the insufficiency of those elements which are taught them. Higher education is given in schools founded by the natives, but on which the Government imposes methods of work which recall mediæval scholasticism, and do not permit proper development of Tunisian thought. No attempt is made to change these superannuated methods; a few years ago, indeed, some students were laid under academic interdiction for having demanded that the curriculum be revised.

Denied any knowledge of his own history, or of European history, the native Tunisian is intellectually unprepared to shake off his yoke—and colonialism has nothing to fear.

We have given here only the most salient and fundamental facts of French conduct in Tunisia. It would be easy to supply details relating to the French administrative policy of justice, of military affairs, of civil liberty. Our Tunisian friends do not wish any more half measures, nor reforms. They demand their complete independence, the chance to develop freely in their own proper *milieu* the social qualities which are theirs. When public opinion grasps the problem, when it learns the evils which our friends across the Mediterranean suffer, there will not be a voice in France, except that of our imperialists, to oppose complete freedom for Tunisia.

Government by Consent

SIR SIDNEY LOW, the English author and journalist, writing to the London *Daily Chronicle*, of the influence of the war in doing away with class distinctions, goes on to discuss the nature of government in the coming democracy.

If this reading of the "trend of evolution" is correct, it seems to me that the new democracy is going to be rather unlike what a good many of our new democrats expect. Labor, we are told insistently, has at length come into its own, and it will use its opportunities as other ruling classes have done before, and generally "boss" things in its own interests. It will, sooner or later, command the majority of votes; it will, therefore, be the real sovereign, and will do what it pleases. . . .

The shifting of the electoral balance is supposed to have transferred to the labor masses the unlimited power exercised in turn by the Crown, the aristocracy, and the mercantile bourgeoisie. Are we, then, merely to have another class government, which will, in fact, be another class tyranny? That is what the Russian Bolsheviks, and their admirers and disciples everywhere, openly aim at creating.

I think they will be disappointed, because I do not believe in the permanent solidarity of labor, or the permanent division of classes. I do not see working men becoming an order, an estate of the realm, to use the old term, as the barons, the burgesses, and the clergy formerly were. On the contrary, I anticipate that in a community where all work, and where most are paid by wages in some form, there will be no specialized "working class" or wage-earning class.

How will this react on government? It will, I think, do away with the crude simplicity of force-politics. The governing authority will not be able to obtain its mandate by the sheer mass-weight of a majority vote, which is, after all, only a convenient and civilized substitute for physical pressure. There may indeed be no majority vote at all, and no clear majority, but only a great number of different groups, combining intermittently and irregularly as occasion offers.

Government will then become an affair of arrangement and consent. Instead of the executive being able to bear down all opposition by the veiled, but recognized, coercion of numbers, it will have to deal with many associations, none of overwhelming strength. It will be compelled to carry on a good deal of the national business by agreement, instead of by dictation.

Some lawyers and political theorists may be shocked at the idea that there is not to be somewhere an irresistible authority in the state. But we are aiming at abolishing power-politics in international relations in favor of understanding and agreement; and in private life we carry on most of our affairs that way.

I believe that the same process will be applied more and more to national and economic business. Government by consent will mature as government by command wanes. An executive that seeks to reconcile as many interests as possible, and arranges to satisfy a great variety of tastes and sentiments, will be much more truly representative of democracy—which means the rule of the people as a whole—than one which carries out the wishes of the class or crowd that happens to control the electoral weapon. The mere circumstance that this is the largest crowd does not render its assertion of force any the less despotic. And despotism, force-government, an inheritance from the past, is becoming an anachronism for which there will be steadily diminishing scope in a new era dominated by the ideals of reason freedom, and justice.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Notes

WITH a view to relieving the British House of Commons of the mass of detail involved in handling local affairs, a non-partisan resolution has been introduced, calling upon the Government to appoint "a parliamentary body to consider and report (1) upon a measure of federal devolution applicable to England, Scotland, and Ireland, defined in its general outlines by existing differences in law and administration between the three countries; (2) upon the extent to which these differences are applicable to Welsh conditions and requirements; and (3) upon the financial aspect and requirements of the measure." A group in Parliament which fears that England, because of its greater area, wealth, and population will overshadow the other three divisions, has offered an amendment which provides that England is to be divided into three provinces whose prospective legislatures shall meet at London, Winchester, and York. The idea of federal devolution was first introduced in 1885 by Joseph Chamberlain who, at that time, pleaded the urgent need of such reform.

THE French Government has put into effect a long and detailed law on the reparation of damages in the invaded regions. The law provides for the indemnification of persons, concerns, companies, and communities for material and direct losses to real estate and personal property which resulted from the war. This includes not only losses suffered as a result of requisitions on the part of enemy troops and authorities, but also losses sustained on account of damages caused by French and Allied armies in connection with attacks or with preventive measures of defence. The amounts of the damages are assessed by local committees and in specified cases by special war damage courts. Where reconstruction takes place, the indemnity is assessed to cover the incidental expenses. The claimant of an indemnity has two years in which to decide whether he wishes to reconstruct, and in cases where the indemnity has been satisfactorily settled and the claimant wishes to proceed with the work of reconstruction at once, a preliminary payment of 25 per cent. of the sum is provided for. A very interesting article of the law provides that a manufacturer who has reconstructed his establishment is to notify the Minister of Labor at least fifteen days before the date on which he will be ready to operate. The Minister of Labor will then take steps to notify the former employees of the manufacturer. This law was put into effect on April 17, 1919.

A Franco-Irish Society has recently been formed by a group of Irish business men resident in Paris. The objects of the Society are to encourage and support all efforts calculated to make better known in Ireland and in France the respective industrial resources and products of the two countries; to act as a link between producers and consumers in both countries by placing at their disposal all statistical, technical, and other information, and such practical aid as the society can provide; and, by various means, to promote the economic interests of Ireland.

THE *Landtag* has been engaged in drawing up a new constitution for Bavaria, and the *Münchner Neueste Nachrichten* publishes a summary of the salient points of the document. The provisions include universal suffrage, state education, liberty of conscience, and the separation of church and state. The right of private property is recognized, and provision is made for compensation in cases where property is nationalized. The socialization of industry is to be gradual; it will be effected only by legal methods, and will be adapted to the conditions in each industry. The Ministry is to be elected by the Diet and will be responsible to that body. The Diet will be elected trienially by secret, direct, and proportional suffrage, and will have one deputy for every 40,000 electors. It will meet at least once a year; its debates must be public; and it may be dissolved by the action of the Ministry, by a vote of one-fifth of the electors, or by a two-thirds majority of its own members. Councils of all branches of labor will be organized, with the right to propose motions in the Diet. The new constitution will also provide for popular initiative and referendum, but in all cases, the final decision is to remain in the hands of the Diet.

AN official communication to Swedish newspapers states that the Swedish delegates at Paris on April 22 handed the president of the Peace Conference a note setting forth the claims of Sweden in regard to the Aland Islands. The memorandum submitted to the consideration of the council that the Aland Islands had always been considered an administrative unit in the old Swedish kingdom until Sweden was forced to renounce them in 1809; that the population was of Swedish origin, and in 1917 had declared its desire to be reunited with the mother country. Early in 1918 it petitioned the Royal Swedish Government to that effect, and also sent a petition to the Governments of the United States, France, Great Britain and Italy, requesting that the strong and united will of the people for a reunion with Sweden be given due consideration at the peace negotiations and that they be permitted to express this desire by means of a plébiscite. The note stated that the solution of this question was closely bound up with the relations between Sweden and Finland, and that the Swedish Government, in its desire to maintain friendly relations between the two countries, had made repeated fruitless attempts to come to an understanding with the Finnish Government in this matter. The delegates, therefore, requested that Sweden be given an opportunity to discuss the question before the Conference; that the inhabitants of the Aland Islands be permitted to hold a plébiscite; and that in case the islands are given to Sweden, arrangements be made to prevent their being used as a military base, or being subject to foreign attack.

AS a result of conferences held between the Italian authorities and the Arab and Berber chiefs, the Italian Government has issued a decree granting to natives of Tripolitania a large share in the administration of colonial government. Natives are given complete local citizenship, and, under certain conditions, may acquire full Italian citizenship. The decree provides for a local assembly, appointed by the governor, which will deal with local legislation, direct taxes, etc.; and for a governor's council consisting partly of Government officials and partly of members elected by the local assembly from its own number. These bodies will be assisted by district and regional councils elected by the people. Municipalities will be governed by elected representatives.

AN exhaustive study of the "Effects of the War upon Insurance, with Special Reference to the Substitution of Insurance for Pensions," by Professor William F. Gephard of Washington University, has lately been published under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace. The study is issued as the sixth of a series of preliminary economic studies of the war, edited by Professor David Kinley of the University of Illinois, a member of the committee of research of the Carnegie Endowment.

Contributors to this Issue

FLAVIO VENANZI is a well-known Italian journalist and lecturer on economic subjects.

EUGENE S. BAGGER is a Hungarian journalist at present living in the United States.

W. P. CROZIER is a military critic, on the staff of the *Manchester Guardian*.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For Summer Reading

The Oxford Books of Verse

To the lover of poetry, no volumes could be more welcome than these choice anthologies. Their very physical appearance conveys a sense of ripeness and ease and grace in the intellectual life and their pages are a source of unending delight.

The Latest Volume

The Oxford Book of Australasian Verse

Chosen by W. MURDOCK

Net $3.00

A book with the tang of the antipodes: the fresh and rapidly moving picture of new lands and scenes. An interesting selection of some two hundred poems by Australians and New Zealanders, from Wentworth and Adam Lindsay Gordon to the poets of the present day.

Twelve other volumes. Each, net, $3.00

Also on Oxford India Paper

Cloth, Net $3.75

EDINBURGH BOOK OF SCOTTISH VERSE
1300-1900
Chosen and Edited by W. MACNEILE DIXON

OXFORD BOOK OF BALLADS
Chosen and Edited by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH

OXFORD BOOK OF FRENCH VERSE
XIII CENTURY-XIX CENTURY—(*in French*)
Chosen by ST. JOHN LUCAS

OXFORD BOOK OF ITALIAN VERSE
XIII CENTURY-XIX CENTURY—(*in Italian*)
Chosen by ST. JOHN LUCAS

Persian Morocco, Net $6.00

OXFORD BOOK OF ENGLISH VERSE
A. D. 1250-1900
Chosen by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH

DUBLIN BOOK OF IRISH VERSE
1728-1909
Chosen by JOHN COOKE

OXFORD BOOK OF SPANISH VERSE
XIII CENTURY-XX CENTURY—(*in Spanish*)
Chosen by JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY

OXFORD BOOK OF GERMAN VERSE
(*In German*)
Chosen by H. G. FIEDLER

Full Morocco, Net $10.00

OXFORD BOOK OF ENGLISH MYSTICAL VERSE
Chosen by D. S. NICHOLSON *and* A. H. LEE

THE OXFORD BOOK OF VICTORIAN VERSE
Chosen by SIR ARTHUR QUILLER-COUCH

OXFORD BOOK OF CANADIAN VERSE
Chosen by WILFRED CAMPBELL

OXFORD BOOK OF LATIN VERSE
(*In Latin*)
Chosen by H. W. GARROD

Uniform with the Above

A Book of the Sea

Selected by LADY SYBIL SCOTT

Net $3.00

On *Oxford India Paper,* Net $3.75

An anthology divided into four parts: Lyrics, Reflections and Pictures, Stories of Beauties and Wonders, and Sailors, Their Deeds and Songs.

"Nine out of ten people will recognize immediately the value of this particular work, in which distinctive taste and a good deal of personal courage have united with an almost uncanny knowledge of sea literature from the earliest ages."—*N. Y. Sun.*

Oxford Book of American Essays

Chosen by BRANDER MATTHEWS

Net $1.50

On *Oxford India Paper,* Net $2.75
Persian Morocco, Net $3.50

A notable collection of thirty-two essays wise, witty and serious, representative of the best American work from Franklin and Irving to Crothers and Trent.

The Editor's aim has been to show "our significant traits, the diversity and breadth of our interests rather than the presenting of individual performers."

The Book of Sorrow

Chosen and Arranged by A. MACPHAIL

Net $3.00

On *Oxford India Paper,* Net $3.75

"This volume contains much that has been said—in fact almost all that has been well said—upon the theme of sorrow."

Two hundred and seventy authors are represented, including Addison, Bridges, Bronté, Bliss Carman, Austin Dobson, Dante, E. W. Goose, Heine, Herrick, Lowell, Milton, Henry Newholt, Swinburne, Katherine Lyman, Whitman and many others of equal prominence.

Take this ad to your bookseller. Give him your name and we will send you, free of charge, our illustrated magazine, **"The Periodical."** *If no bookseller is convenient, make request directly to us.*

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS
American Branch
35 West 32nd Street
New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED